Contact
B.L. Fisher Library
Asbury Theological Seminary
204 N. Lexington Ave.
Wilmore, KY 40390

B.L. Fisher Library's Digital Content
place.asburyseminary.edu

PHILIPPIANS 2:5-11: ETHICS OR SOTERIOLOGY?

by

Wayne Robert Major

A thesis submitted

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts in the Department of Biblical Studies

Asbury Theological Seminary

Fall 1994

Approved by Robert W. Lyon

Department New Testament

Date 2-6-95

PHILIPPIANS 2:5-11: ETHICS OR SOTERIOLOGY?

by

Wayne Robert Major

A thesis submitted

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts in the Department of Biblical Studies

Asbury Theological Seminary

Fall 1994

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to thank Dr. Robert W. Lyon, the thesis advisor, for his patience and assistance, and for holding the author to the exegetical task.

The author also wishes to thank Mr. John Seery for his assistance in locating valuable library resources.

Grateful thanks is also given to Dr. Herbert Dongell for his help with matters of interpretation, and to Dr. Joseph Dongell for his aid in understanding technical aspects of the Greek language.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Acknowledgements i
Introduction 1
  Statement of the Problem 1
  Review of Related Literature 3
  General Method of Procedure 9
  Scope and Limitations 9
  Justification for the Study 10

Chapter

1. A Historical Perspective 16
   The City of Philippi 16
   Christians at Philippi 17
   Date and Place of the Letter 17
   Authorship of the Epistle 19
   Purpose of the Letter 20

2. An Understanding of Morality 22
   A. Morality vs. Christian Morality 22
      The Incarnation 22
      The Language of Imitation 24
      Freedom of the Will 27
      Obedience Motivated by Love 28
   B. Pauline Morality 32
      Paul and Koinonia 32
      Paul and Imitatio 33
      Paul and Obedience 35
      Paul and the Holy Spirit 37

3. The Interpretation of Morphe 42
   Summary 47

4. The Interpretation of Harpagmos 50
   Summary 53

5. Authorship of the Hymn 57
   Influences 57
   Structure 58
   Language 59
   Theology 61
   Context 63
   Summary 66

6. Influences on Composition 71
   The Second Adam Theory 71
   The Servant of Yahweh Theory 75
   The Heavenly Man Theory 80

7. The Meaning of the Phrase "in Christ" 84

Some Notes on Paul's Use of the Phrase 84
The Position of Kaesemann 85
Kaesemann's Position Examined 86
Other Considerations 89
Summary 91

8. The Question of Pre-Existence 95
Linguistic Considerations 95

9. Conclusion 100

Bibliography 105

INTRODUCTION

The Thesis Proposal

Statement of the Problem

This paper will investigate the Kenosis passage of Philippians 2:5-11 to determine a proper understanding of the significance of the passage. The key focus will be on the traditional "ethical interpretation," which suggests that the hymn is set forth as a moral or ethical example for the believer. The work will be divided into the following sub-problems:

Sub-Problem #1: the interpretation of morphe

Problems of interpretation arise in the different interpretations of morphe theou (or "'form' of God," v. 6) and morphe doulos (or "'form' of a servant," v. 7). Many scholars distinguish the term morphe from the similar words eikon and schema, while others treat them synonymously. These two different approaches are reflected in much of the critical discussion of morphe.

Sub-Problem #2: the interpretation of harpagmos

The traditional AV rendering of this word was "robbery," that is, Christ "did not consider it robbery to be equal with God." this understanding led to a rejection in favor of the less offensive idea of "grasping," "clutching," or "clinging." The question of "seizing" versus "grasping" has tremendous bearing on interpretation. Latin terms are usually used to refer to the different positions on interpretation of this little used word: res rapta, "a thing obtained by snatching"; res retinenda, "a thing clung onto in a grasping fashion; and res rapienda, "a thing to be grasped but not already possessed." There is even debate over the issue of the meaning of each of these Latin terms.[5]

Sub-problem #3: questions of influence on composition

Much support has been offered for the position that the obedience of Christ is set forth as a contrast to the disobedience of the first Adam. The idea is certainly not foreign to Pauline thought (see Rom. 5:12-21), but the question remains whether this point was being addressed in the hymn. A little less explored but no less viable consideration is that the themes of humiliation and obedience depend directly on the Suffering Servant passage of Isaiah 53, with linguistic parallels extending even before and after, particularly the direct reliance upon Isaiah 45:23 for the exaltation section of the Philippian hymn. In addition, some discussion will be given to the theory of Gnostic or Hellenistic background, such as set forth by Kaesemann.

Sub-Problem #4: the question of authorship of the hymn

Many have defended the assumed authorship of Paul, but the trend in modern scholarship finds other origins. Lohmeyer saw the hymn as a translation of a Hebrew or Aramaic original.[1] this view finds common acceptance, although another view suggests that Paul is the author but composed the hymn at an earlier time rather than at the time he wrote the Philippian correspondence.[2] Another possibility exists that the hymn is a later insertion by another author, but Martin says there is "not a shred of evidence to support this."[3]

Sub-Problem #5: the meaning of "in Christ"

The ethical interpretation has also been challenged on another front, the question of what it means to be "in Christ," a common Pauline expression of the Christian life. Kaesemann in particular draws a qualitative boundary between morality in and of itself and morality as it finds its expression within the framework of the Christian life.[4]

Sub-Problem #6: the question of pre-existence

To what extent does verse six indicate or imply the pre-existence of Christ and what are the implications? Much of the weight of interpretation lies in the meaning of hyparchon ("being"). The main focus of debate centers on whether "being in the form of God" signifies prior existence or Christ's earthly life.

Review of Related Literature

With the abundance of literature on this passage, an overview such as this can be a tremendous undertaking. However, the problem statement narrows the focus of this study to a consideration of the ethical (or moral) interpretation of the passage.

Historically, there have been several lines of interpretation.[6] The Lutheran tradition, or what Martin calls the "Dogmatic" view, places the action of the "self-emptying" in verse seven during the earthly life of Christ, for instance, during the temptations. Although this view has found some support, it has been argued against on the grounds that the participle hyparchon of verse six refers to a prior existence rather than a subsequent one.[7]

The most famous theory, and the one for which the passage has generally come to be known, is the theory of Kenosis. The main tenet of this position is that Christ through the process of self-emptying came to be revealed through human existence alone, divesting Himself of the attributes of omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence. Perhaps the most widely known version of this theory is by Gottfried Thomasius, Christi Person und Werk.[8] The idea was later modified by several others so that kenosis involved "a reduction of the divine attributes from actuality to potentiality."[9] This theory has fallen on hard times, since it has been refuted strongly on theological grounds.[10]

The traditionally accepted view, and perhaps the most prevalent, is the "ethical example" interpretation. This is the position inherited from the early Church Fathers, which holds forth the example of Christ's self-humiliation as a model for the Christian to follow. The position is still widely held today, but has suffered serious setbacks in recent years, particularly at the hands of German scholarship. Ernst Kaesemann, in his "Kritische Analyse," effectively refuted the position with his assertion that the phrase "in Christ" in verse five is a Pauline expression for the Church, which signals not an ethical exhortation, but an expression of the life of Christ in the Church as a body. He also followed Hofmann and J. Kogel in suggesting that the verb usually supplied in verse five in incorrect. Whereas the traditional verb supplied was a form of "to be" (en or "was"), Kaesemann supplies a repetition of "think," or "have this mind" (phroneite).[11] In recent years the ethical example position has been more successfully defended by those who offer to substitute the term "conform" in place of "imitate."[12]

At the very heart of this paper is an attempt to understand the purpose of the introduction of the Christ-hymn into its context. The traditional understanding of early scholars was that it served a hortatory purpose of urging believers to an imitation of Christ. Thus, the primary objective at the beginning of this review is to determine a range of sources which will provide a supportive framework based on biblical ethics and morality and, more specifically, morality and ethics in Paul's theology. The next step will be to address the more general works of literature; that is, those which provide either a strong overview or a well-accepted exegesis of the passage as a whole. The final section of the review will be concerned with those works which address the individual sub-problems of this study.

To lay the groundwork for an understanding of biblical ethics, James Gustafson's Christ and the Moral Life[13] is a good place to start. Although at many points his comments appear to

fall toward a rejection of the ethical viewpoint, the value of his book for the purposes of this paper lies in his pertinent mediating comments. His main point seems to be semantic, since he reiterates the point that Christ's example is not a moral ideal, but a pattern. Similar to Gustafson's book, but theologically deeper and less concise, is Newman Smyth's Christian Ethics,[14] upon which Gustafson also relies. Hurtado's "Jesus as Lordly Example in Philippians 2:5-11"[15] provides some valuable insights into possible presuppositions that underlie the positions taken by Kaesemann and R. P. Martin, to be discussed later in this review.

A good attempt at mediation is undertaken by John Webster in "The Imitation of Christ."[16] He takes care to couch his discussion in clearly defined terms to avoid what he sees as a problem with the "language of imitation." He followed this work with a similar article, "Christology, Imitability, and Ethics."[17] E. J. Tinsley offers two profitable works on the subject. His "Some Principles for Reconstructing a Doctrine of the Imitation of Christ"[18] gives a brief discussion of the commonly used terms imitatio and conformitas. A more detailed and useful bit of work is The Imitation of God in Paul,[19] which contains a chapter on Paul's ideas on the imitation of Christ.

The preeminent work on this passage is Ralph P. Martin's Carmen Christi.[20] Published over twenty-five years ago, it is still considered to be the authoritative voice that every writer must consider. At its best, this is a masterpiece of summarization of all the various positions taken. At its worst, it is only a summarization, and Martin has been criticized for his failure to supply his own views and interpretation. However, he makes no attempt to conceal his support for the position of Kaesemann, and he offers some of the most direct discussions to be found on the ethical view. Many of his other comments, though, will not be critical to the focus of this paper, since his extensive exegetical section is largely a summarization of the most respected scholarly opinions. For those opinions, the original authors and works themselves will be consulted. Thus,

while Carmen Christi is valuable in its own right, only the discussion of the ethical view and a few other relatively small portions of the work will be considered for this particular effort.

In addition to Martin's noted effort, a number of other works are available for a good general overview of the passage. Beare's commentary[21] is probably the most quoted, and Lightfoot's commentary[22] is comparable in popularity. For a discussion of diverse views, commentaries by several other notable scholars will also be included. In addition, some more recent exegetical efforts will be examined in an effort to seek out fresh interpretive light. J. Harold Greenlee's An Exegetical Summary of Philippians[23] offers a good summary, from a linguistic point of view, of the various interpretations of the problematic words and phrases in the passage. Peter O'Brien's commentary[24] does some close examination of the Greek text and offers good interpretive insights.

Rounding out this section, and by no means least in importance, are four strong studies, each significant in its own right. James G. Dunn's much-quoted Christology in the Making[25] presents a good study of the angle of Adam/Christ (or first and second Adam) Christology. The Humiliation of Christ[26] by A. B. Bruce is another well-known and often-cited work, even after nearly a century, probably because of the author's clarity and pioneering scholarship. His Appendix, Lecture I, contains some valuable study of the early Church Fathers, and an evaluation of some of the critical work done up until the author's time. C. F. D. Moule's "Further Reflexions on Philippians 2:5-11"[27] offers some valuable insights and gets cited more often than many commentaries. N. T. Wright's Climax of the Covenant[28] is a relatively new work which covers most of the problems of the text, and discusses at great length the meaning of harpagmos.

The focus now turns to the individual problems of the text, with attention given first to the phrase "in Christ." The interpretation of this phrase is a problem only relatively recently introduced. Although Ernst Kaesemann may not have been

the first to introduce his interpretation, he certainly gave validity to a reading of the text which says, "Have this mind in you which also you have in Christ," rather than the traditional "which was also in Christ." His "Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2, 5-11"[29] laid claim to an interpretation of this exhortation as an urging to the Philippians to remember whose they are and to live out this "Christ-life" which is already in them, rather than an exhortation to imitation. In 1968 this work was translated from the German to become available to English readers as "Critical Analysis of Phil. 2:5-11."[30]

Another helpful discussion of this phrase is John Nielson's In Christ,[31] which undertakes a more thorough investigation of the use of the phrase, both in the Pauline corpus and in the rest of the New Testament. Although this book is a little less valuable because it deals less directly with the Philippian passage, the discussion still inevitably focuses on the use of the phrase in Pauline thought, with good supportive material on the source and general significance of the phrase.

Since Kaesemann's introduction of his interpretation of this phrase, several scholars have focused on his work. Some of these will be considered for this paper, most notably Morna D. Hooker, a supporter of Kaesemann's position. In Preface to Paul,[32] she devotes an entire chapter to discussion of this phrase. Interestingly, though, her discussion in From Adam to Christ[33] (written ten years later) seems to reject Kaesemann's position in favor of an ethical interpretation which favors the idea of "conforming" rather than "imitating."

Hooker's writings, however, may be of more value for her support of the Second Adam theory. The array of authors offering support or rebuttal of this position can be overwhelming, but some seem to stand apart from the rest and will be given stronger consideration. Among these are: Dunn's Christology, N. T. Wright's Climax, J. M. Furness, "Behind the Philippian Hymn,"[34] and C. A. Wanamaker's article, "Philippians 2:6-11: Son of God or Adamic Christology?"[35] This list is by no means exhaustive in relation to the focus of this work, but provides a

foundation upon which to consider the wealth of material available. The works of Hooker and Wright will also be of value in the discussion of the possibility of a background in the Servant Songs of Isaiah 52-53. In addition to these, others of value in this effort will be Dodd's review of Kittel in Journal of Theological Studies,[36] H. Wheeler Robinson's The Cross in the Old Testament,[37] The Servant of God[38] by Walther Zimmerli and J. Jeremias, and Feinberg's article "The Kenosis and Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Analysis of Phil. 2:6-11."[39] Hopefully a full discussion of both sides of the issue will be possible through consideration of these and other works.

The doctrine of the Second Adam is also involved in much of the discussion concerning another issue, the idea of pre-existence. Charles Talbert's "The Problem of Pre-Existence in Philippians 2:6-11"[40] begins with a form analysis and follows his conclusions about form to an Adam/Christ typology that he says is pre-Pauline. L. D. Hurst, in "Re-Enter the Pre-Existent Christ in Philippians 2.5-11?"[41] deals more directly with the question of whether the humiliation of Christ was an action of the pre-existent Christ or of the human Jesus. A great deal of his discussion involves a critique of Dunn's Christology. Perhaps a more helpful article on this particular problem is John McQuarrie's "The Pre-Existence of Jesus Christ,"[42] which offers a wider look at the idea of pre-existence in Pauline thought and in the rest of the New Testament.

The other two sub-problems deal directly with two words contained in the Greek text: morphe and harpagmon. For an interpretation of these terms, the first sources to consult are the Greek word study tools mentioned earlier. In addition, several short articles deal directly with each sub-problem and address issues not covered, not settled, or not clarified by the discussion in the commentaries. Morphe seems to have received the least attention. Martin's article Morphe is the only one found available for inspection other than the extensive discussion found in some of the older commentaries.

Harpagmos receives more attention, with several short

articles that will be considered. In addition, two longer articles may shed further light with their extended investigations of the word. Roy Hoover's "The Harpagmos Enigma: A Philological Solution"[43] delves into the limited but possibly helpful occurrences of the word and its (questionable) equivalent, harpagma, in classical Greek literature. N. T. Wright's "Harpagmos and the Meaning of Philippians 2:5-11"[44] does a commendable job of reviewing and evaluating the critical discussion of the meaning of this word.

An examination of each of these discussions related to Philippians 2:5-11 should provide a strong foundation for determining a proper understanding of this passage in its context.

General Method of Procedure

Each of the sub-problems will be examined according to the following considerations: a study of the range of critical discussion of the passage; an examination of the Greek text, including an analysis of the work of exegetes and scholars who have done detailed study of the text; and a search for any new light on each problem relative to the ethical interpretation.

The paper will be organized around each of the sub-problems, with a chapter devoted to each. These will begin after a chapter on historical background, and a chapter devoted to Pauline concepts of morality and imitation. A final chapter will attempt to summarize and pull together the discussion.

Scope and Limitations

This paper will not attempt to settle questions of form. Ever since the detailed form analysis set forth by Ernst Lohmeyer,[45] there has been a general acceptance of the hymnic structure of the passage, although the details of that structure are still being debated. For this study, the hymnic form is not a major question, although such an assumption is in no way

intended to discount the value of form analysis. The main concern is that many of the form analyses have severed the passage from its context, leading to interpretations that treat the hymn as a separate entity. The assumption for this study will be that whatever may have been the original form of the verses in question, they are now to be treated as inseparable from the immediate context. The overall purpose and flow of thought are not interrupted by the inclusion/insertion of the "hymn."

Since the setting here in the Philippian letter is the only sitz im leben available for the hymn, the assumption will be made that the correct determination of meaning will depend more directly on Paul's use of the hymn to enforce his exhortation than on any prior meaning the hymn either has or may have had. This effort finds general agreement with the statement, "Setting aside the immediate context of Phil. 2:5-11 with its obvious paraenetic concerns works unnecessary mischief upon the exegetical enterprise."[46] Thus, while such background motifs as the Second Adam, Servant Song, and Heavenly Redeemer theories will be considered, more weight will naturally be given to considerations within the hymn itself and its immediate context within the Philippian epistle.

Justification for the Study

Since the ethical interpretation has been called a "traditional" position, and since criticism against the position has arisen fairly recently, some sort of understanding of what the position states should be readily available. However, even the most strongly critical detractors seem to put forth only vague notions of what an "ethical" interpretation is. Their rejection seems to be focused against the idea of simple imitation, a position which no one actually seems to favor anyway. Therefore, one focus of the present effort will be to determine a foundation for a definition of what an ethical interpretation should involve.

While many writers have defended the ethical position, none seems to have done so systematically and intentionally. That is, while much has been said in support of the ethical view, and much has been done to determine the interpretation of the individual problems of the text, direct consideration of the ethical interpretation often gets left behind after verse five. There are reasons for this situation, usually dealing with questions of authorship of the hymn, and its place in the epistle. In spite of such difficulties, this paper will attempt to carry out this focus throughout both the entire text of the hymn and its immediate context.

INTRODUCTION NOTES

1 Quoted in Ralph P. Martin, Carmen Christi: Phil. ii. 5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship, (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1967), p. 46.

2 Most ably stated by Ethelbert Stauffer, New Testament Theology, trans. John Marsh, (London: SCM Press, 1955), 284.

3 Martin, Carmen Christi, 61-62. Martin mentions E. Barnikol and Robert M. Hawkins.

4 Ernst Kaesemann, "A Critical Analysis of Philippians 2:5-11," trans. Alice F. Carse, Journal for Theology and the Church vol. 5 of God and Christ: Existence and Province, ed. Robert W. Funk, (N. Y.: Harper & Row, 1968), 50-51.

5 See N. T. Wright, Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 64-71.

6 This discussion of lines of interpretation is dependent on Ralph Martin, Carmen Christi, 63-93

7 A good argument of this position is made by Alfred Plummer, A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, (London: Roxburghe House, 1919), p. 42.

8 Gottfried Thomasius, Christi Person und Werk, (Erlangen: Andreas Deichert, 1886).

9 Eugene R. Fairweather, "The Kenotic Christology," in F. W. Beare, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians, (N. Y.: Harper & Brothers, 1959), 161.

10 See, for example, D. M. Baillie, God Was in Christ: An Essay on Incarnation and Atonement, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948), 94-98; J. S. Lawton, Conflict in Christology: A Study of British and American Christology from 1889-1914, (New York: MacMillan, 1947), 132; and Fairweather, 162.

11 Kaesemann, "Critical Analysis," 50-51.

12 A few that will be of value to this effort are C. F. D. Moule, "Further Reflexions on Philippians 2:5-11," Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce on His 60th Birthday, eds. W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970), 264-76; John B. Webster, "The Imitation of Christ," (Tyndale Bulletin 37, 1986), 95-120; L. W. Hurtado, "Jesus as Lordly Example in Philippians 2:5-11," From Jesus to Paul: Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare, eds. Peter Richardson and John C. Hurd (Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 1984), 113-26.

13 James F. Gustafson, Christ and the Moral Life, (New York: Harper & Row, 1968).

14 Newman Smyth, Christian Ethics, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), 54.

15 L. W. Hurtado, "Jesus as Lordly Example in Philippians 2:5-11," From Jesus to Paul: Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare, eds. Peter Richardson and John C. Hurd, (Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier UP), 1984: 113-26.

16 John B. Webster, "The Imitation of Christ," Tyndale Bulletin 37 (1986): 95-120.

17 John B. Webster, "Christology, Imitability, and Ethics," Scottish Journal of Theology 39, No. 3 (1986): 309-26.

18 E. J. Tinsley, "Some Principles for Reconstructing a Doctrine of the Imitation of Christ," Scottish Journal of Theology 25, No. 1 (Feb. 1972): 45-57.

19 E. J. Tinsley, The Imitation of God in Paul: An Essay on the Biblical Basis of Christian Spirituality, (London: SCM, 1960).

20 Martin, Carmen Christi.

21 F. W. Beare, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians, (N. Y.: Harper & Brothers, 1959).

22 J. B. Lightfoot, Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1953).

23 J. Harold Greenlee, An Exegetical Summary of Philippians, (Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1992).

24 Peter T. O'Brien, The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text, in New International Greek Testament Commentary, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991).

25 James D. G. Dunn, Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation, (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980).

26 A. B. Bruce, The Humiliation of Christ: in its Physical, Ethical, and Official Aspects, (Cincinnati: Jennings and Graham, 1895).

27 C. F. D. Moule, "Further Reflexions on Philippians 2:5-11," Apostolic History and the Gospel, eds. W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970): 264-76.

28 Wright, Climax of the Covenant.

29 Ernst Kaesemann, "Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2:5-11," Zeitschrift fur Theologie und Kirche 47 (1950): 313-60.

30 Kaesemann, "Critical Analysis."

31 John B. Nielson, In Christ: The Significance of the Phrase "In Christ" in the Writings of St. Paul, (Kansas City: Beacon Hill, 1960).

32 Morna D. Hooker, A Preface to Paul, (New York: Oxford UP, 1980).

33 Morna D. Hooker, From Adam to Christ: Essays on Paul, (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990).

34 J. M. Furness, "Behind the Philippian Hymn," Expository Times 79 (Mar. 1968): 178-82.

35 C. A. Wanamaker, "Philippians 2.6-11: Son of God or Adamic Christology?" New Testament Studies 33 (1987): 179-93.

36 C. H. Dodd, review of Theologisches Worterbuch sum Neuen Testament, by Gerhard Kittel, Journal of Theological Studies 39 (Jan. 1938): 287-93.

37 H. Wheeler Robinson, The Cross in the Old Testament, (London: SCM, 1956).

38 Walther Zimmerli and J. Jeremias, The Servant of God, (Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1957).

39 Paul D. Feinberg, "The Kenosis and Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Analysis of Phil. 2:6-11," Trinity Journal 1, n.s. no. 1 (1980): 21-46.

40 Charles H. Talbert, "The Problem of Pre-existence in Philippians 2:6-11," Journal of Biblical Literature 86 (June 1967): 141-53.

41 L. D. Hurst, "Re-enter the Pre-existent Christ in Philippians 2.5-11?" New Testament Studies 32, no. 3 (July 1986): 449-57.

42 John MacQuarrie, "The Pre-existence of Jesus Christ," Expository Times 77, no. 7 (Apr. 1966): 199-202.

43 Roy W. Hoover, "The Harpagmos Enigma: A Philological Solution," Harvard Theological Review 64 (1971): 95-119.

44 N. T. Wright, "Harpagmos and the Meaning of Philippians 2:5-11," Journal of Theological Studies 37, no. 2 (Oct. 1986): 321-52.

45 Ernst Lohmeyer, Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2, 5-11, 1928, summarized by R. P. Martin, Carmen Christi, 25-27.

46 Hurtado, 119.

CHAPTER ONE

A Historical Perspective[1]

The City of Philippi

The history of Philippi extends back to the fourth century B.C. In 359 B.C. Philip II, father of Alexander the Great, seized power over the region of Macedonia, originally called Thrace, in northern Greece. The area was known for its wealth of springs and rich gold mines. Philip naturally desired to fortify the area to protect his assets, and the place he chose was the old city of Krenides, or "little fountains." The city became an important strategic link for major military and trade endeavors. Philip followed the normal custom of naming the city after himself, resulting in the name of Philippi.

Changes came in 168 B.C. when Rome conquered the region and divided it into four districts. Further changes resulted from the famous battle at Philippi in 42 B.C. Brutus and Cassius were slain by Octavian and Antony, and Philippi was made a Roman colony. After Antony's death, his followers were dispossessed of their land and resettled at Philippi by order of Augustus, significantly enlarging the city. At this time Augustus renamed the city, and it became known as Colonia Julia Augusta Victrix Philippensium.

The city, like many Roman colonies, was modelled essentially after the city of Rome. The layout and the architecture were very similar, and Roman currency was used. The designation as a Roman colony was a trade-off: Rome would extend its boundaries of protection, and Philippi would receive the benefits that accrued to Roman citizenship. Rule was by two local magistrates, or praetores, like those Paul mentions in Phil. 1:13.

The religion of Philippi was a mixed blend of Greek gods, usually known by the names of their counterparts in the Roman system; the goddess Artemis; Egyptian gods; and the Jewish God, though the Jews were an extremely small minority. The Jews

were probably persecuted, and Christians were probably later associated with Jewish worship, so that the "suffering" or "conflict" that Paul mentions (1:27-30) may involve persecution for their religious practices.

Christians at Philippi

The story of the spread of the gospel to Philippi is found in Acts 16:6-40. Paul had just set out on his second missionary journey, accompanied by Silas, and was joined by Timothy at Lystra. Having been forbidden by the Holy Spirit (16:6-7) to go into either the provinces of Asia or Bithynia, they turned to Troas, where Paul had a vision of a man from Macedonia asking for their help (v. 9). They set course and went to Samothrace, Neapolis, and finally Philippi. On the sabbath, they found a group met to worship by the river, where they found their first convert in the person of Lydia (vv. 14-15).

They eventually ran into problems for casting a spirit of divination out of a slave-girl, for which they were brought before the magistrates, beaten, and imprisoned (vv. 16-24). That night as they were singing, there was an earthquake, which set them free and eventuated in the conversion of the jailer (vv. 25-34). When it was found that they were Roman citizens, the magistrates were afraid, and apologized and asked them to leave the city (vv. 35-40). The strong conversion of these two converts probably established the nucleus for the Church at Philippi. The strong presence of women in this church is interesting to note. When they first arrived, the group they met at the river was a group of women (Acts 16:13). The first convert was Lydia, and Paul mentions Euodia and Syntyche in the letter to the Church at Philippi (Phil. 4:2).

Date and Place of the Letter

Much disagreement has centered around the discussion of the date and origin, with the most commonly accepted theory placing

the writing at a prison in Rome, probably about 60-62 A.D. That it was written from prison is clear from Phil. 1:7, 13-14, 20-24. Most commentators correlate the epistle with the events of Acts 26:1-28:31, Paul's appeal to the emperor and his subsequent trip to Rome. His other imprisonments were at Philippi (definitely excluded), Jerusalem, and Caesarea.

Hawthorne[2] makes a strong case for a Caesarean origin. Some of his more pertinent points are: (1) the imprisonment at Caesarea was for at least two years (Acts 24:27), allowing time for several communications between the two points; (2) the events at Caesarea account for the indication that Paul has made a defense and yet remains in prison (Phil. 1:7, 16)--while the account of the Roman imprisonment does not indicate that any defense has been made; (3) a Caesarean origin would better explain Paul's plans to visit the Philippians (Phil. 2:24), since a Rome setting would mean that he had changed earlier plans to travel west and visit Spain (Rom. 15:24).

O'Brien[3] counters the Caesarean theory with the following points: (1) there probably were not enough Christians in the city of Caesarea to provide for the division and factions of Phil. 1:14-18; (2) the tone of the Caesarean imprisonment does not accord with the tone of martyrdom found in the letter; (3) the expected finality of the verdict would fit better at Rome, since he could have appealed to the emperor if imprisoned at Caesarea (as he later did in Acts 25:10-12).

Some scholars[4] also suggest the imprisonment spoken of here was at Ephesus. Ephesus seems to be considered largely because of the difficulties of distance and the numerous communications which took place during Paul's imprisonment. The relatively short distance between Ephesus and Philippi more easily accounts for these journeys. However, no evidence exists that Paul was ever imprisoned at Ephesus. Also, the same argument still holds that Paul would have appealed to Rome had he been at Ephesus.

A Rome setting is probably more likely, supported on a number of grounds: (1) Paul was under guard, which we know of the Rome imprisonment from Acts 28:16; (2) members of Caesar's

household are mentioned in Phil. 4:22; (3) Phil. 1:12-18 suggests a lengthy imprisonment, which we also know from Acts 28; (4) there were many preachers in the city (1:14), not as likely at the other possible sites; and (5) Paul was expecting a decisive verdict, which would determine life or death (Phil. 1:20-24). The weight of the evidence suggests Rome as the location of the writing of the Philippian letter.

Authorship of the Epistle

Most scholarship has come to general agreement that Paul is the author of the Philippian epistle. Relatively few arguments have been offered against Pauline authorship. Most of the problems with the epistle involve not authorship, but integrity. Objections have been raised on the following points: (1) the change in tone from v. 3:1 to 3:2; (2) change in content, from 3:2-4:1, which is considered by many to be an interpolation; (3) the use of the word "finally," v. 3:1, seen as an indication that the letter is about to end, when it actually continues for two more chapters.

The first objection is answered by the contention that it is a change of subject, not necessarily tone, although that is involved too. The practice is one suggested as common to Paul. The second objection is not necessarily valid, since Paul has already mentioned the "adversaries" (1:28) and a "crooked and perverse generation" (2:14). The third objection is based on the Greek to loipon, which Paul also uses in I Thessalonians 4:1, with a considerable amount of writing following that instance as well.

The advent of the computer age has introduced new methods of approach to this issue. A. Q. Morton and J. McLeman[5] argue against Pauline authorship of Philippians based on computer studies of the frequency of Paul's use of kai. However, such methods have met with skepticism in general as to their validity.[6] Overall, the weight of scholarly opinion favors acceptance of Pauline authorship of Philippians.

Purpose of the Letter

The purposes for Paul's writing are easily ascertained from within the text of the letter itself. (1) In 1:12, Paul says, "I want you to know," followed by an exposition of his current circumstances and expectations. His first intention seems to be to inform them of his situation, since they probably sent questions about the matter with Epaphroditus. (2) Paul was impressed both by the desire of the Philippians to send him gifts (4:18) and by the ordeal endured by Epaphroditus in his journey to see Paul (2:25-28). Therefore, he strongly desired to express his written thanks to them. (3) Epaphroditus has obviously brought some sort of indication to Paul concerning the current condition of the Church at Philippi, and Paul sends them words of guidance and encouragement.

CHAPTER ONE NOTES

1 Differences of opinion in this chapter will be footnoted accordingly. The otherwise general information contained will depend upon the following sources: Gerald F. Hawthorne, "Philippians," Word Biblical Commentary, Vol. 43, eds. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker, (Waco, Tex.: Word, 1983), xxvii-lii; William Hendriksen, New Testament Commentary, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1962), 3-40; Peter T. O'Brien, "The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text," New International Greek Testament Commentary, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 3-38; and Marvin R. Vincent, International Critical Commentary, Vol. 36, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1950), ix-xxxvi.

2 Hawthorne, xli-xliv.

3 O'Brien, 23-24.

4 Hawthorne, xxxviii, lists C. R. Bowen, A. Deissman, G. S. Duncan, J. Ferguson, V. Hinshaw, W. Michaelis, and D. T. Rowlingson.

5 A. Q. Morton and J. McLeman, Paul, the Man and the Myth: A Study in the Authorship of Greek Prose, (N. Y.: Harper & Row, 1966).

6 O'Brien refers to H. K. McArthur, "Kai Frequency in Greek Letters," New Testament Studies 15 (1969), 339-49; H. K. McArthur, "Computer Criticism," Expository Times 76 (1965), 367-70; and M. Whittaker, "A. Q. Morton and J. McLeman, Theology 69 (1966), 567-68.

CHAPTER TWO
An Understanding of Morality

A. Morality vs. Christian Morality

The Incarnation

The first concern in understanding an ethical interpretation of this Philippian passage is to attempt to understand the nature of the change in ethical thinking brought about by the entrance of Christ into the realm of humanity. Ever since the explosion of Christianity into the world at the experience of Pentecost, the world recognized that the character of a true Christian was different. "Christianity presents a changed conception, a new type, of virtue. . . . The Christian character, when it was first seen among men, appeared as a new thing, as a distinct moral type."[1] Understanding the difference in this "changed conception" can be a tremendous task, involving as it does the hard questions of free will versus divine initiative, Law versus grace, and many others.

One consideration in delineating this change is the actual Person of Christ. After all, the difference in His very character was evident throughout His earthly life in His words and His actions. Newman Smyth tells us,

> The word righteousness in the Old Testament seems to have contained the moral conception of conformity to some norm. . . . Righteousness became synonymous with obedience to the law of the Lord. . . . the divine law is the will in which God's moral being finds expression of its absolute worth. The fullest historic expression of His good will is the life of Jesus Christ. Hence the Christ is revelation also of the law of God.[2]

Thus the OT conception of morality as a "conformity to some norm," which had been the Law, now finds expression in a new "norm," the character and Person of Jesus Christ.

This is not to say that what is seen in the Person of Christ may be reduced to moral expression of what is good, or right. It simply means that for the ideal expression of moral character, we

need look to no other standard. True, this discussion presupposes the framework of the Jewish background, but with the understanding that many other conceptions were similar in their outlook, basing attainment of moral character on the adherence to a set of external values, usually a code of laws that must be kept. Thus, the implication of the change wrought by Christ in moral understanding is that it is no longer necessary to view morality as doing, but as being. The expression of what the moral law demands is found not in the written Word, but in the life of Christ. Spohn says,

> The love that Christ demands has a shape to it, a shape learned only from the experience of actually having been love by Christ. The present experience of believers is normatively formed by the New Testament witness of Jesus and the whole story of God's dealings with Israel. Each virtue of the Christian life refers in some way to this pattern of God's love and finds as its motivation a grateful response to that enduring love. . . . Because the love that is at the core of all virtues of the Christian life has this same fundamental pattern, each of those virtues can be understood only in reference to the biblical testimony of how that distinctive love first appeared.[3]

Whether one gives assent to Spohn's description of the life of Christ as the Christian's "pattern," or to similar but connotatively different terms such as "ideal" or "model," the indication is that there is something of value for the believer in the embodiment of the moral law as found in Christ. In light of this understanding, the Christian should find agreement with Paul's statement, "I want to know Christ" (Phil. 3:10). This "knowledge" of Christ is a personal relationship with Him through the power of the resurrection, through which potential for moral growth is realized. But, as Gustafson describes it, "Our relation to Christ is not established for its moral potential, but moral expression of it is both an outgrowth and a requirement of it."[4] He goes on to say, and this is a focal point of this chapter, "The Christian life is not less moral because it is not primarily moral."[5]

To sum up this discussion on the basic change of morality brought on by the Incarnation: the traditional way of thinking

ethics, expressed by Keck as, "What ought I to do?--together with, "How can I know the answer?"[6]--has shifted. John Webster describes the change: "The real ethical question is no longer 'what is to be done?' That question is replaced by the two-fold question 'what has ben done?' and 'what remains to be done?'"[7] What has been done is the work of Christ on the Cross, and the Resurrection, by power of which He brings humanity into fellowship with Him. What remains to be done will be covered in part by the discussion below.

The Language of Imitation

If Christ is said to be the embodiment of the moral law which is at the heart of Old Testament Law, then it remains for the follower of Christ to reproduce in his/her own character, in some fashion, the same qualities of Christ which express that moral perfection. Seeking to be like the beloved Model has been the desire of many an earnest Christian. John Chrysostom wrote, "Nothing rouses a great and philosophic soul to the performance of good works, so much as learning that in this it is likened to God."[8] This idea of imitatio Christ found expression in the title of Thomas a Kempis' book On the Imitation of Christ. The idea has found its way into countless hymns: "Oh, to be like Thee! Blessed Redeemer,/This is my constant longing and prayer./Gladly I'll forfeit all of earth's treasures,/Jesus, Thy perfect likeness to wear.";[9] and "Be like Jesus, this my song,/In the home and in the throng:/Be like Jesus all day long!/I would be like Jesus."[10] The list of expressions of the principle is endless.

With such widespread expression, it seems that some mode of definition could be found that would gain unanimity. Such has not been the case. The language of imitation presents problems to the minds of many scholars, and with good reason. Webster does a fine job of pointing out some of the difficulties with the idea of imitation of Christ. "The language of imitation appears to detach moral obligation from the objective accomplishment of

human righteousness in Christ."[11] The concern is that the Christian will separate "good works" from the work of Christ and seek to "earn" the free gift of salvation. Another concern is that "Imitation language may make it acutely difficult to state the distinction between Christ and the Christian, since it may imply that human morality is in some sense an extension of continuation of his work rather than a testifying to it in properly human and derivative action."[12]

E. J. Tinsley attributes dislike of imitation language to Luther: "Imitatio he disliked because he thought it suggested some human moral endeavour to emulate Christ. . . . He preferred to speak of conformitas to Christ. . . a process of conformation to Christ through the work of the Creator Spirit."[13] Tinsley attempts to mediate the position by including both terms.

> In a fully developed theology of the Christian life as imitation of Christ both the terms conformitas and imitatio would need to be used. The imitative life of the Christian involves both God's activity, through the Spirit, in conforming men to his image in Christ (conformitas), and man's focusing of his moral and spiritual attention on the exemplar, Christ (imitatio).[14]

That is, the entire nature and purpose of imitatio is to point the human spirit toward conformitas with the divine will as it relates to moral expression as it is found in the Person of Christ.

Other scholars have taken different approaches in the attempt to avoid imitation language. Webster speaks of "analogy" and "correspondence": "The Christian both is and is not his own. . . . because of their gracious participation in God through Christ, Christians are enabled to act in such a way that their acts correspond to the acts of the Saviour."[15] Barnabas Lindars views imitation as a "response," partly because he separates "imitation of God" from "imitation of Christ." The response, he says, is the imitation of God, and the imitation of Christ is the agent of producing that response.[16]

But whatever the choice of words, the problem with imitation is semantic as much as anything else. If Luther had a problem

with the language in his time, then in Western culture of our time the problem is enlarged by the connotations the word has assumed. A common phrase of the day is "cheap imitation," and one of the definitions listed for imitation is "counterfeit."[17] However, semantics do not play a part with some of the historical problems with the term. Much rejection has come on the part of those who assume that all ideas of imitation would lead to the same errors of the ascetics who practiced all sorts of self-mutilation in the attempt to "suffer with Christ" in the closest way possible. Concern along these lines may be avoided if the point is understood that not the acts of Jesus, but the character and motivations of the acts are the objects of imitation. As Beet states it, "We are directed rather to those Divine acts of the Son which seem to be the farthest from our imitation. . . . The impossibility of direct imitation concentrates our attention upon the inner thought of which these are the outward expression."[18] Even Christ Himself was clear on that point: "Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Matt. 5:48, said in the context of loving one's enemies). And even when He seems to have called for an imitation of a specific act--"I have set you an example, that you also should do as I have done to you" (John 13:15)--He is calling not for them to wash each other's feet (although that thought is by no means excluded), but to imitate the attitude of humility that leads to such service to one another.

Again, imitation language is to be understood in terms that do not over-emphasize either the human or the divine aspects of Christian morality. We have in the Person of Christ a perfect example, model, pattern, ideal, etc. to which we look for the character, thought, and conduct of our heavenly Exemplar. This idea sets Christian ethics apart from other ethical concepts. "This emphasis upon imitation which characterises the Christian ethic is unique among ethical creeds and systems; and that for a very good reason. No other creed or system can provide a suitable model."[19]

Freedom of the Will

Essential to the idea of imitation of Christ is the belief in man's freedom of choice to do so. The Philippian hymn appears in the context of exhortation to humility and obedience and urges Christ as the model of perfect obedience to the will of the Father. But the concern voiced by many critics of the ethical interpretation is that it emphasizes human response to the neglect of divine initiative. Hence it may be suggested that the possibility exists that critics of the position may come from a position that emphasizes divine initiative over the idea of free will. The difficult thing to do from either background is to develop a position that balances both of these. A point that must be made here is that the idea of free will is necessary to man's response to the divine will. Wiley tells us,

> Man by his very constitution is a self-conscious, self-determining being. He is a free moral agent, and hence has a capacity for performing moral action. Moral action in turn demands a law by which character is determined--a law which may be either obeyed or disobeyed by the subject. Otherwise there would be no moral quality, for neither praise nor blame could be attached to either obedience or disobedience. This would destroy the character of the moral agent. It is evident, therefore, that the power to obey or disobey is an essential element in a moral being.[20]

This freedom in no way destroys or compromises the concept of God as sovereign. The same God who created Adam with the ability to choose rightly or wrongly, has determined that humanity shall be free in spite of the disastrous cost that is made possible. "Human freedom is a capacity of moral receptivity which God has set as a limit to his own almightiness."[21] But included in that freedom is the moral demand of a holy God who desires a holy people. That demand is made possible by this "moral receptivity"--as we become receptive to the initiative of God in sending His Son, and in the gift of the Holy Spirit, then our response comes from the deepest inner part of the self. The willingness of God to give His Son shows that "Christian obligation is not a harsh reversal of grace but a way of affirming human significance."[22]

The Cross becomes central to this response--as we realize the depth of the divine initiative, then the response of obedience to the divine will takes on a more earnest nature. But the response does not stop there: "The goal [of human striving] is the most complete approximation of human moral and religious perfection that can be achieved. God's work in the cross is an 'assistance' and makes our achievement possible."[23] Thus the obedience which was not found in Adam becomes possible through the work of Christ, whose life-giving Spirit gives new motivation from within, enabling us to feel the divine "pulse" kindling the desire to follow.

Again, perhaps the best terms to express the human side of Christian morality are "receptivity" and "response." The work of the Spirit in producing the behavior God desires must be understood as involving both human and divine elements. The work of human action is to see the Christ in front of us, beckoning, showing by the life and example before us that we ought to follow Him and emulate the Ideal as we find it embodied in him. The divine side is the work of the Spirit to provide the enabling motivation to conform to that Ideal to which we aspire.

Obedience Motivated by Love

Another problem that must be addressed in understanding Christian morality is the place of the Law. After all, "No one will be justified by the works of the law" (Gal. 2:16). Yet, at the same time, "The law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good" (Rom. 7:12). Wiley speaks of a law "by which character is determined,"[24] a law which for the Jewish community before Christ would have entailed the Law of Moses. The general recognition in Christian ethics is that the coming of Christ forever altered the concept of law; the question debated by some is in what way it was altered.

One way to determine the nature of this change is to track the development of new understanding throughout the Old Testament. A difference may be noticed, for example, by the time

the prophets came upon the scene. Much of the difference, however, involves not the understanding of, or approach to, law-keeping, but the expression of it.

> There is an essential unity of the Law and the Prophets in perspective and over-all purpose. For example, the perspective is as God-centered in the Prophets as in the Law. . . . There was a sense, however, in which the main burden of their preaching was an effort to call the people back to a proper understanding of and obedience to the Law. . . . The ethical, however, is more central in the Prophets than in the Law. In the latter the distinction between the ritual and the moral is not as clearly drawn as it is in the Prophets. Furthermore, the Law does not as specifically place the ethical above the ritual as did the Prophets.[25]

The prophets were concerned with the heart of the Law and not the outward expression or ritual. An example is found in Micah 6:8--"What does the Lord require of you? To act justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with your God." The prophets spoke as the voice of Yahweh calling His people back to the covenant relationship He had established with them. Certainly the rituals had been established by Him and had their place, but the response He sought from His people was one of loving obedience to Him.

Another area to examine is the expression of devotion found in the Psalms. Since they cover an extensive range of Israel's history, they might be expected to reflect a broad range of opinion in relation to the Law. The only problem to be confronted is the different genre. "Since the Psalms were the songs of Israel, we should not expect a great deal of ethical material. . . . The Psalms contain, however, considerably more moral and ethical content material than is found in most contemporary hymnbooks."[26] The ethical expression of the Psalms was based on the covenant love of Yahweh, but even more so on His very Person and character: "I am the Lord who brought you up out of Egypt to be your God; therefore be holy, because I am holy" (Lev. 11:45). Maston[27] points to the abundantly used Hebrew term hesed, usually translated "mercy," "loving-kindness," or "steadfast love." He cites 120 uses of the term compared to 130 in the remainder of the Old Testament. Many of these uses

reflect a direct response to this aspect of the nature of Yahweh: "In the morning I will sing of your love, for you are my fortress, my refuge in times of trouble" (Psa. 59:16); "Within your temple, O God, we meditate on your unfailing love" (Psa. 48:9). The same term was found in the Prophets: "For I desire mercy (hesed), not sacrifice, and acknowledgement of God rather than burnt offerings" (Hosea 6:6).

If the alteration of the ethical expression of law-keeping were summed up succinctly, it could be said to be replaced by the "law of love." Smyth says Christ brought "a new and better obedience. It works by love. . . . The stone once taken away, the moral nature, responsive to the warmth of the divine love, can break through its earthly corruption."[28] When Christ was asked which commandment was the greatest, He replied, "'You shall love the Lord with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind.' This is the greatest and first commandment. And a second is like it: 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself'" (Matt. 22:37-39). Paul echoes the reply: "For the whole law is summed up in a single commandment, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself" (Gal. 5:14). And in another place, Jesus says, "I give you a new commandment, that you love one another. Just as I have loved you, you also should love one another" (John 13:34).

Obedience is thus not superseded by Christ, but transformed to take on a new character. Obedience is no longer seen as necessary for acceptance with God, but as a loving response to what God has done in Christ to show His acceptance of those who will hear the Son. Following Christ still means being conformed to Him in obedience; however, "The center of the conformation is more religious than ethical in character. . . . we have communion with him. Our communion leads to more distinctively ethical attitudes and actions, namely obedience and deeds of love."[29]

The key point here is "attitudes and actions," an understanding that Christ said to love one another "just as I have loved you." And the way He loved us was to give Himself in obedience to the will of the Father, to die for our salvation.

The Incarnation "is God's most personal revelation of Himself; and greater love than to give his own life, hath no man. . . . Thus the incarnation, ethically conceived, becomes the last word of creative Love" (emphasis author's).[30] Thus the transformation of ethics brought about by the action of Christ has created an ethic of love, not an abrogation of the law, but a new creation of a better way. This "new covenant" was spoken of by Yahweh in Jeremiah 31:33--"I will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." This new law of "obedience in love" is illuminated and directed within by the presence of the Holy Spirit. Ethical choices are not now made from the presence of cold standard from without that works its way into the behavior by fear of punishment, but from the warmth of the abiding presence of holy love, working His way and will from within to the outer manifestation in the acts of the believer.

With this in view, the Philippian hymn in its hortatory context may be seen as an encouragement to follow the kind of love expressed by God's gift to us in the Person of Jesus in the Incarnation.[31]

> We have and we must have an ethical God; a God whom we can love, and in whom we can trust. . . . Let us remember that it is a fundamental conception in the Christian idea of God that God is love; and that it is the fundamental dogma of the Christian religion that God so loved us that He gave Himself for us. Accordingly, the primary presupposition of our present passage is that our God was capable of, and did actually perform, this amazing act of unselfish self-sacrifice for the good of man.[32]

Since this expression of love took the form of an action of obedience, and since it found supreme expression in Christ, the imitatio Christi may be seen as a valid response. Christ's desire that we "love one another as I have loved you" (John 13:34), and that we "be perfect, even as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Matt. 5:48), are rooted in the perfect model or pattern we find in the actions of Christ--and the perfect expression of that love is found in one who will "lay down His life for His friends" (John 15:13). Paul tries to take the thought a step

further: "Indeed, rarely will anyone die for a righteous person--though perhaps for a good person someone might actually dare to die. But God proves his love for us in that while we still were sinners Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:7-8). We need no greater model. "God's redemptive activity in Christ is an expression of his love, and Christ's own act of obedience unto death for the sake of others is commended as exemplary for all who belong to Christ. To 'imitate Christ' means to give one's self in love for others as he gave himself."[33]

B. Pauline Morality

Paul and Koinonia

A key to understanding Pauline morality is to understand his concept of the church. Paul's concept of the Church as a "body" (Eph. 4) necessarily involves his idea of koinonia, a "fellowship" or "participation" in the life and death of Christ. For Paul, this participation begins in the Eucharist.

> In developing the idea of koinonia Paul's originality is evident. He depicts the Eucharistic cup and Eucharistic bread as forming the fellowship with the person of Christ and develops his thought further to the point of saying that this koinonia with Christ produces a new koinonia among those who partake of the cup and bread. . . . Thus the vertical move of the Christian towards a fellowship with the Son is brought to include the horizontal plane: the community.[34]

When Paul speaks of this "sharing" or "participation" in the "horizontal" sense, the "vertical" sense is not far from his mind. In this thought he follows, in many ways, the true thought of Christ's command to "love one another." In Phil. 2:1, he writes of "sharing in the Spirit," and proceeds from that thought to humility and concern for others. For Paul,

> The ultimate ideal for Christian conduct became that which promoted true koinonia (fellowship), with the Lord and, which was but another way of saying the same thing, with the brethren. Christ dwelt in them; they actually formed his body. . . . to Paul the effectual way to guard against letting liberty degenerate into license was continuously to render services to one

> another. Cease this, and not only would the body of believers fall apart, but the connection of the individual Christian with his Lord would also be sundered.[35]

The foundation for this participation in Christ was the presence of the indwelling Holy Spirit.

> Men come together in Christ through the Spirit, they grow in Christ through the Spirit. It is in the Spirit that we become partakers of Christ and become a fellowship among ourselves. . . . Thus the Spirit becomes the dynamic force behind the whole koinonia process.[36]

If then "God is a Spirit" (John 4:24), and "God is love" (I John 4:8), then the Christian's "participation in the Spirit" is a participation in love. This love must first be shown to those who are already a part of this participation: "So then, whenever we have an opportunity, let us work for the good of all, and especially for those of the family of faith" (Gal. 6:10). Although Paul does not expressly exhort or encourage the Philippian Church to love one another, the thought is inherent in his encouragement to unity and fellowship. "Almost every moral precept is based on its effect on the brethren. The social virtues--love, harmony, service--are never forgotten. . . . The law of the Spirit makes men one; it is only the law in their members that makes them many."[37]

Any concept of imitatio in its proper relation to the Philippian hymn must be understood in the light of the Pauline ideas of fellowship. Any exhortation Paul might have given was given with a view of the Christian life as a life of participation in Christ.

> We practise humility, charity, patience, obedience etc. because Christ practised them. But we can say this only when we have established independently that these virtues were integral to the work of redemption and therefore an element in Christ's solidarity with men which leads to participation in God.[38]

Paul and Imitatio

What Paul does or does not do with the idea of imitatio

Christi is a key point in understanding both Pauline morality and Pauline exhortation. While Paul laid much emphasis on the "free gift" of grace, he did not neglect the importance of the human will in cooperating with the inner workings of that grace. The human will in Pauline thought is a will that is centered on Christ rather than on conformity to moral standards. So Paul's use of exhortation is a call to conform one's will, by the Spirit of grace, to the perfect standard or pattern seen in Christ. His appeal to the Galatians reflects his thought: "My little children, for whom I am again in the pain of childbirth until Christ is formed in you" (Gal. 4:19). And to the Ephesians he speaks of "building up the body of Christ, until all of us come to. . . the measure of the full stature of Christ" (Eph. 4:12b-13, written in the context of the purpose of spiritual gifts.) Thus, if we accept the earlier discussion of the balance of divine sovereignty and human will, we may agree with Davies that from the human side of Christian ethics, "Every Christian is pledged to an attempted ethical conformity to Christ; the imitation of Christ is part and parcel of Paul's ethic.[39]

Not everyone agrees with this interpretation of Paul's use of the imitation of Christ. R. P. Martin makes the claim that "Paul never uses the earthly life of Jesus as an exemplum ad imitandum, as though he were suggesting that all that a Christian has to do is to follow in the Master's footsteps."[40] Martin's comment seems to reflect an understanding of imitation as a simple repetition of what is seen in the behavior of Christ rather than as a working of the Spirit of grace in aiding the Christian to conform his/her behavior to Christ. One would have difficulty finding someone who actually holds to such an understanding of the imitation of Christ. In addition, Hurtado says, "If this rather astonishing statement means what it appears to say, it goes against evidence in the Pauline letters."[41]

The evidence, while not overwhelming, speaks in favor of Hurtado. Rom. 15:2-3a says, "Each of us must please our neighbor for the good purpose of building up the neighbor. For Christ did

not please himself." Perhaps a stronger example is found in Ephesians: "And be kind to one another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, as God in Christ has forgiven you. Therefore be imitators of God, as beloved children, and live in love, as Christ loved us and gave himself up for us, a fragrant offering and sacrifice to God" (Eph. 4:32-5:2). And Paul says to the Thessalonians, "You became imitators of us and of the Lord, for in spite of persecution you received the word with joy inspired by the Holy Spirit, so that you became an example to all the believers in Macedonia and Achaia" (I Thess. 1:3-4), a statement that hints at the purpose of imitating Christ's example in order to become an example.

The argument against Pauline use of the imitation of Christ is that he usually uses himself as an example rather than Christ. However, the instances of Paul's use of himself as example are not numerous, and these uses are usually linked to imitation of Christ as well. For example, Paul says, "Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ" (I Cor. 11:1). Paul was well aware that what he was, he was through Christ, and it was his imitation of Christ, his incorporation of Christ-like behavior, that he called others to imitate. "The Christian is urged to take any fellow-Christian as a living contemporary model for the imitatio Christi in so far as he finds there, to whatever degree, humility, self-giving, service."[42]

Paul and Obedience

Some remarks may be made here concerning Paul's understanding of obedience as reflected in the attitudes of Christ's followers. Often ethical consideration is placed outside of Pauline thinking in favor of his emphasis upon being "in Christ" or a part of His Church. This attitude is only a partial reflection of Paul's thought.

> The current tendency of exegesis to deny that Paul was concerned with ethical disposition. . . is right in so far as it stresses Paul's certainty that exhortation or appeal to inner human potentialities was fruitless; but once a man is given standing within the new

> community, he must work out the consequences and "become what he is."[43]

The idea of "become what you are" is a popular one based on an acceptance of a similar force carried by Pauline indicatives and imperatives. The idea is not necessarily valid, however. Furnish tells us, "Paul does not. . . presume that the Christian's obedience is a 'spontaneous' expression of the new life. The Pauline indicatives and imperatives are both to be taken seriously."[44] The tendency of many in the attempted dialectic of "become what you are" is to come down too heavily on the side of the indicative to the neglect of the force of the imperative, making exhortation a simple re-statement of what the readers already (should) know. Perhaps a distinction should be made between what the Christian "is" actually and what the Christian "is" potentially because of the new life in Christ. This forced dialectic does not work, simply because the potential not yet realized is what Paul exhorts upon his readers. The "already" and "not yet" are not to be combined, although the change in standing brought about by Christ has created the potential.

Another concern that may be at work here is an attempt to uphold Paul's rightful stand against attempted salvation by works, or the law. But what Paul really attacked is the legalism associated with attempting to follow the law. Paul rejected "law as an arrogantly and arbitrarily chosen target of human ambition and as a system of human achievement, that is, legalism.[45] Paul had himself experienced the difficulties involved in trying to force himself by his own efforts to comply with the law's demands: "I do not understand my own actions. For I do not do what I want, but I do the very thing I hate" (Rom. 7:15). Yet at the same time, he could say, "I delight in the law of God in my inmost self" (Rom. 7:22) Those who reject any sort of ethical interpretation of the Philippian hymn tend to do so in a manner that seems to be concerned with defending against suggestions that obedience means keeping the law. But Furnish suggests,

> Paul understands man's response to be an expression of God's power to redeem and transform, not of man's power

> to comply and perform. . . . Here, as always in Paul's thought, what God gives is inseparably tied to what he asks; where the command is heard, the power to obey is also received.[46]

The answer to the dilemma of obedience is a major focus of Paul's thoughts of Christian conduct. Even in the Philippian passage in question, Paul follows up his exhortation to obedience with, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling" (v. 13), an emphasis on the human response--followed by, "For it is God who is at work in you," an emphasis on divine aid in "becoming." The divine aid or "power to obey" is central to Pauline thought. Moule tells us, "The law is impotent and weak because its scope is limited to a man's material, physical aspects, and does not touch his motives. . . . it still remains for something less external to put it into effect."[47] That "something less external" is the Holy Spirit, the essential Divine Aid in Paul's concern with Christian obedience.

Paul and the Holy Spirit

For Paul, the Spirit is the focal point of Christian obedience, without whose Presence obedience to Christ is not possible. "For Paul the Spirit becomes the source of Christian morality. . . . it was Paul who isolated the moral aspect of the activity of the Spirit and thus brought order into the confusion of popular Christian thinking in this field."[48] Paul says, "If it had not been for the law, I would not have known sin" (Rom. 7:7). If Christ is to be viewed as the fulfillment of the law in the Person of holy love, then Paul's statement takes on a new meaning. The revelation of Christ in the heart as the law of love kindled by the presence of the Spirit, brings illumination of sin in all its depths. This awakened sense of sin in the heart brings recognition, but recognition does not automatically produce positive change. The work of the Holy Spirit must reach the will to energize it for change, to begin the process of "working out" the possibilities of the Christian life.

In the New Testament righteousness is still an absolute

> law of life; but it is a righteousness whose measure and rule is to be found in no merely external authority and in no maxim of the scribes; its law is inward and spiritual, for it is the righteousness of faith in Christ. The Christian rule of conduct is the perfect Character. The standard of righteousness by which conduct shall be finally judged, is the law of the Spirit within the heart.[49]

This thought of the law of the Spirit in the heart seems to have been especially true for Paul. "If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit that dwells in you. . . . for if you live according to the flesh, you will die; but if by the Spirit you put to death the deeds of the body, you will live" (Rom. 8:11, 13). The Spirit will point to the work of Christ, because He is the "Spirit of Christ" (Rom. 8:9). Thus the <u>imitatio Christi</u> becomes a key point in Pauline thought of the work of the Spirit in putting away sin and living a life of harmony with the desires of a righteous, holy God. "The death he dies, he died to sin, once for all; but the life he lives, he lives to God. So you also must consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus: (Rom. 6:10-11). The presence of the Spirit is a life-giving presence that takes away cold morality and replaces it with a love for Christ that leads to a desire to obey His commands. "We are not confronted with a series of moral imperatives, or a bloodless, lifeless picture; rather, we are confronted with a living person, from whose life emanates a Spirit that kindles our spirit to follow him."[50]

CHAPTER TWO NOTES

1 Smyth, 54.

2 Ibid., 124-26.

3 William C. Spohn, What are They Saying About Christian Ethics?, (N.Y.: Paulist, 1984), 16.

4 Gustafson, 175.

5 Ibid., 183.

6 Leander E. Keck, "Justification of the Ungodly and Ethics," (Rechtfertigung. Festschrift fur Ernst Kaesemann, eds. Johannes Friedrich, Wolfgang Pohlmann, and Peter Stuhlmacher, Tuebingen: I. C. B. Mohr, 1976), 200.

7 Webster, "Christology, Imitability, and Ethics," 313.

8 John Chrysostom, "Works," A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, ed. Philip Schaff, Vol. XIII, (New York: Christian Literature Co., 1889), 206.

9 Thomas O. Chisholm, "O to Be Like Thee," in Worship in Song, (Kansas City: Lillenas, 1972), #68.

10 James Rowe, "I Would Be Like Jesus," in Praise! Our Songs and Hymns, (Grand Rapids: Singspiration, 1982), #384.

11 Webster, "Imitation of Christ," 99.

12 Ibid., 103.

13 Tinsley, "Principles," 45.

14 Ibid., 47.

15 Webster, "Imitation of Christ," 115.

16 Barnabas Lindars, "Imitation of God and Imitation of Christ," Theology 76, No. 638 (Aug. 1973): 402.

17 Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary, (Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam, 1963), 416.

18 Joseph Agar Beet, "Thought it Not Robbery to Be Equal With God," Expositor 5, 3rd series (1887): 125.

19 Lindsay Dewar, An Outline of New Testament Ethics, (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1949), 270-71.

20 H. Orton Wiley, Introduction to Christian Theology, Vol. I, (Kansas City: Beacon Hill, 1946), 162-63.

21 Smyth, 195.

22 Webster, "Christology, Imitability, and Ethics," 316.

23 Gustafson, 180.

24 Wiley, 162.

25 T. B. Maston, Biblical Ethics, (Macon, Ga.: Mercer UP, 1991), 35.

26 Ibid., 74.

27 Ibid.

28 Smyth, 198-99.

29 Gustafson, 173-74.

30 Smyth, 188.

31 This statement is made with the understanding that not all agree that the passage deals with the Incarnation, though it likely is a majority opinion.

32 Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, "Imitating the Incarnation," The Person and Work of Christ, ed. Samuel G. Craig, (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1950), 571.

33 Victor Paul Furnish, Theology and Ethics in Paul, (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968), 235.

34 George Panikulam, Koinonia in the New Testament, (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979), 29-30.

35 Morton Scott Enslin, The Ethics of Paul, (Nashville: Abingdon, 1957), 127.

36 Panikulam, 78.

37 Enslin, 129.

38 Jeremy Moiser, "Dogmatic Thoughts on Imitation of Christ," Scottish Journal of Theology 30 (1977): 212.

39 W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology, (London: SPCK, 1948), 147.

40 Martin, Carmen Christi, 288.

41 Hurtado, 120.

42 Tinsley, Imitation of God, 140.

43 William A. Beardslee, Human Achievement and Divine Vocation in the Message of Paul, (Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1961), 122-23n.

44 Furnish, 227.

45 C. F. D. Moule, "Obligation in the Ethic of Paul," Essays in New Testament Interpretation, (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982), 269.

46 Furnish, 238.

47 Moule, "Obligation in the Ethic of Paul," 267.

48 W. D. Davies, "Ethics in the NT," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, (Nashville: Abingdon, 1990), 174.

49 Smyth, 126.

50 Gustafson, 154.

CHAPTER THREE

The Interpretation of Morphe

A tremendous amount of critical attention has been turned toward the interpretation of morphe and its meaning in this passage, "form of God" and "form of a servant." Most of the focus has been directed to the divine side of the contrast, to determine just what is entailed by the "form of God." The discussion below will attempt to cover the range of thinking as to the meaning of this term.

One of the most common views of the term is that it denotes "outward appearance," much as the definition of "form" in English tends toward the visual apprehension. Behm offers in support, "In all its many nuances, morphe represents something which may be perceived by the senses. . . it does so strictly, not even touching lightly the concept of being or appearance."[1] The latter part of this quote, on "being or appearance," reveals his distinction of the term from schema: "Morphe differs from schema inasmuch as it indicates the individual appearance as it is, while schema refers to its outward representation."[2] The difference, he admits, is only slight between something that may be strictly seen and something that may be perceived by all the senses.

The problem in dealing with this kind of interpretation is simple: how can this definition refer to the "form of God," since He can be neither seen nor perceived by the ordinary senses? The concept has been modified to alleviate the problem, usually by speaking of "mode of being." Trench speaks of "mode of existence," and attributes the morphe theou to equality: "Only God could have the mode of existence of God."[3] Perhaps another way of expressing the thought is that He was "manifesting Himself in some external form through which he could be known, probably to the inhabitants of Heaven, for what He truly was."[4] This statement (which presupposes Christ's pre-existence) solves the tension produced by "external" by expressing it as the "external" (if it may be called such) form exhibited in the

heavenly realm. In recent times, this heavenly form has been compared with the doxa, or "glory" of which Christ divested Himself at the Incarnation.[5]

Gifford takes exception to this interpretation, offering instead the idea that the very essence of God is involved in the morphe. "It includes the whole nature and essence of Deity, and is inseparable from them, since they could have no actual existence without it."[6] Gifford accomplishes this interpretation by referring the "emptying" to to einai isa theo and not to morphe theou. This is justified, he says, by the contrast presented by ouk. . . alla, so that the "being equal with God" consisted of "the condition of glory and majesty."[7]

A contrasting picture is presented by A. B. Bruce:

> We must regard "to be equal with God" as exegetical of "being in the form of God". . . . the subordinate position assigned to the phrase to einai isa theo in the clause to which it belongs, it being placed at the end. . . shows that it simply repeats the idea already expressed by the words en morphe theou hyparchon.
>
> The two phrases being equivalent, it follows that no meaning can be assigned to either which would involve an inadmissible sense for the other. By this rule we are precluded from understanding by the form of God the divine essence or nature; for such an interpretation would oblige us to find in the second clause the idea that the Son of God in a spirit of self-renunciation parted with his divinity.[8]

Bruce outlines the problem which, improperly understood, led to the various kenotic theories of divine limitation in relation to the attributes of God. Other solutions have been offered concerning divine attributes, usually referring instead to the the use of them rather than to the attributes themselves. McClain suggests, "It will not do. . . to say. . . that the Logos gave up the use of the divine attributes. . . Christ gave up the independent use of His divine attributes" (emphasis author's).[9] Lightfoot prefers to speak of Christ divesting Himself of the "prerogatives" of Deity, rather than attributes.[10]

Another view holds that morphe refers not to divinity, but to the "image of God," thus equating the term with the Septuagint use of eikon in Gen. 1:26. This view is widely accepted by those

who put forth the idea of an Adam/Christ contrast in the passage: "In his condition as the image of God in the fullest and most authentic sense, unsullied by selfishness and sin, he had no need to die. Nonetheless, he took on the condition of a slave in accepting death."[11] This view ordinarily avoids the idea of morphe as an indication of Christ's pre-existence, but not necessarily so. Dawe, for instance, writes,

> The Heavenly Man is a being in the "form" or "image" of God. He is a creature of God who, while subordinate to God, still shares the divine being. During his preexistence in the heavenly realm he lives in the presence of the divine glory. But this does not imply that he is a full member of the Godhead. Even in his preexistence the One "in the form of God" is already a man.[12]

This idea of the pre-existent man Christ is probably not one Paul would have espoused.

A well-defined mediating view takes the position that morphe refers to both the heavenly and the earthly forms of existence of Christ. Wilson offers a good example:

> Emptying has two sides. The negative, most definitely expressed by the word, is that what was full now has nothing left in it. But there is also the positive. The contents are now elsewhere, possibly on the ground and so lost, but also, as possibly, now contained in some other vessel. . . . If I am right, St. Paul did not by these words intend to state that in becoming man our Lord had left something of himself behind, but rather to emphasize the completeness of the Incarnation.[13]

The position provides a welcome solution to the problem posed by the "emptying of divinity." F. F. Bruce adds a twist to the view with his comment, "The implication is not that Christ, by becoming incarnate, exchanged the form of God for the form of a slave, but that he manifested the form of God in the form of a slave" (emphasis author's).[14] The idea is that rather than being "hidden" or "divested" as is the common view of Christ's divinity, the servant-form was the best manifestation of divinity. He offers support from John 13:3-5, emphasizing the first part of the passage: "Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he had come from God and was going to God. . . girded himself."

This interpretation is not a new one. We find the same basic understanding as early as Chrysostom, who saw "taking the form of a servant" as an addition.

> We do not find "He became," "He took," concerning His divinity, but "He emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men"; concerning His humanity we find "He took, He became." He became the latter, He took the latter: He was the former. Let us not then confound nor divide. There is one God, there is one Christ, the Son of God; when I say "One," I mean a union, not a confusion, the one Nature did not degenerate into the other, but was united with it.[15]

Attempts at mediation in this manner must take into consideration the fact that the manifestation, or "visibility," of the form of God is still essentially different in the "servant-form." Perhaps F. F. Bruce comes the closest, but he still does not make clear that the "manifestation" of God in the form of a slave is still a change. The idea that the manifestation would be the same without change must be rejected (since God is obviously not manifested in the same way in the heavenly realm). F. F. Bruce most certainly would not intend to suggest this thought, but the door is left open for an objection at this point. Perhaps A. B. Bruce best describes the idea: "Equal to God in nature. . . while ceasing for a season to be His equal in state."[16]

Attention now turns to an analysis of the use of the word morphe in Scripture. The only usage in the New Testament besides the Philippian hymn is in Mark 16:12. The reference probably refers to Luke 24:13-35, the walk to Emmaus, during which the two companions of Christ did not recognize Him. The indication seems to be that they did not recognize Him because His outward appearance (or their perception of it) was altered in some way. However, most scholars agree that the text in which this use appears was not part of the original text of Mark. This fact negates any attempt at a comparison of other New Testament usage.

A check of the Septuagint usage reveals only a dozen appearances of morphe, with the majority by far favoring the sense of "outward appearance," or "form." The use of the term in

Scripture, though minimal, would therefore seem to favor the idea of outward appearance as the general understanding of the term morphe. The cognate metamorphoomai (used of the change in Jesus' features at the Transfiguration) carries much the same root meaning (Mt. 17:2, Mk. 9:2; see also Rom. 12:2 and II Cor. 3:18). Another cognate, morphoomai, is used only once (Gal. 4:19), in a metaphorical sense, and morphosis is used twice (Rom. 2:20, II Tim. 3:5). The latter reference is translated in this exact sense, "outward form." So the examination of the New Testament cognates of the term (no cognates are listed for the Septuagint) tends pretty much toward the same meaning.

A look at the use of eikon is now in order, since it has been asserted that the terms are either similar or interchangeable. One observation that becomes clear early in the Septuagint is that the term is often used in reference to people: man is made in the "image of God" (Gen. 1:26); Seth is in the "image" of Adam (Gen. 5:3). A difference is noted, however, in other books of the Old Testament, when the term is associated with idols: "images" of Baal, II Kgs. 11:18; altars, sacred poles, and "images," II Chr. 33:7; "idol," Isa. 40:19; "abominable images," Eze. 7:20; and "statues," numerous references in Daniel. In relation to many of these, homoioma is used in a way that suggests that eikon refers to the idol itself, while homoioma refers to the thing represented by the idol.

New Testament usage of eikon is interesting, since very little use of the term is available outside of Paul's writings. All three synoptic Gospels carry the story of Christ holding the coin and asking, "Whose head (eikon) is this?" (Mt. 22:20; Mk. 12:16; Lk. 20:24). The term appears again in Heb. 10:1, "The law has only a shadow of the good things to come and not the true form of these realities." Several appearances are found in Revelation, but each with the same reference to the "image of the beast" (13:14-15; 14:9, 11; 15:2; 16:2; 19:20; 20:4). Only eight other appearances are found, all in Paul. Paul only once uses the term in the sense of a physical representation of something else, in Rom. 1:23 in reference to idols. All his

other uses go beyond the physical, in relation to Christ being the "image of God" (II Cor. 4:4; Col. 1:15), or in relation to the believer being made in the "image of God" or being renewed in the "image of Christ" (Rom. 8:29; I Cor. 11:7, 15:49; II Cor. 3:18; Col. 3:10). The most interesting verse in the Pauline usage is II Cor. 3:18, where Paul uses three different words that have appeared in this discussion: "And all of us, with unveiled faces, seeing the glory (doxan) of the Lord as though reflected in a mirror, are being transformed (metamorphoumena) into the same image (eikon) from one degree of glory to another." This verse could possibly lend support to the suggestion that doxa is an equivalent of eikon, and some credibility could also be offered to the idea that the cognate of morphe is intended synonymously.

Summary

The tentative conclusions that may be drawn are not great in number or weight. Morphe seems to have the more limited use, usually in reference to the outward physical form or appearance of something or someone. Eikon (especially in Paul) tends toward a more metaphoric meaning of "representation" or "resemblance" and is not restricted to the outward or physical, except in the numerous references to idols in the Septuagint. Thus while morphe is used to speak of an object or person in the shape or form by which they may commonly be recognized, eikon is used in the sense of a representation or "reproduction" of the object or person. The two may be said to be used synonymously in some ways, but probably not as strictly interchangeable terms.

A factor that must be weighed and balanced for its worth, though not a strong focus in this study, is the hymnic form of the passage in question. If the subject matter is indeed in poetic form, then the appearance of words similar in meaning may be an indication of repetition or parallelism. In relation to morphe then, Silva's point of "semantic neutralization" is well worth noting. "It would be difficult to prove that if these

three terms [morphe, homoiomati, schemati] were interchanged, a substantive semantic difference would result."[17] Thus the meaning of morphe could be understood in the light of the parallel phrases: "form of God" may be similar to "equal with God"; "form of a servant" may express the same idea as "likeness of men" and "in fashion as a man."

The word morphe itself and its cognate usage seem to indicate a meaning of "physical shape" (or form) by which a person or thing may be distinguished from other persons or things. Morphe understood as "essence" or anything more than "physical" or "outward" form goes against the term's meaning in Scripture. Such definitions of the term probably express an underlying concern to defend against the Docetic understanding of "mere appearance" that has no basis in reality. The morphe theou in which Christ had His existence was exchanged for the morphe doulou, a change of habitation from the heavenly realm to the earthly.

CHAPTER THREE NOTES

1 J. Behm, "Morphe," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Vol. 4, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 745-46.

2 Ibid., 743.

3 Richard Chenevix Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), 262.

4 Alva J. McClain, "The Doctrine of the Kenosis in Philippians 2:5-8," Biblical Review 13 (Oct. 1928): 514.

5 Thomas A. Thomas, "The Kenosis Question," Evangelical Quarterly 42 (July-Sep. 1970): 146.

6 E. H. Gifford, "The Incarnation: A Study of Philippians II. 5-11," Expositor, 5th ser. 4 (1896): 176.

7 Ibid., 245.

8 A. B. Bruce, 18-19.

9 McClain, 519.

10 Lightfoot, 112.

12 Donald G. Dawe, The Form of a Servant: A Historical Analysis of the Kenotic Motif, (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963), 39.

13 W. E. Wilson, "Philippians ii. 7," Expository Times 56 (1944-45): 280.

14 F. F. Bruce, 270.

15 Chrysostom, 80.

16 A. B. Bruce, 20.

17 Moises Silva, The Wycliffe Exegetical Commentary: Philippians, ed. Kenneth Barker, (Chicago: Moody, 1988), 126.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Interpretation of Harpagmos

One of the most tangled problems of this passage is the question of defining the little-used word harpagmos. The word appears only here in the New Testament and nowhere in the Septuagint, leaving the determination of its meaning to cognate usage and usage in extra-biblical literature. Descriptions of the meaning of the word are usually expressed in Latin terms: res rapta, the "active" sense of the word, "to seize or rob"; res retinenda, the "passive" sense of the word, "to cling to or clutch"; and res rapienda, another passive sense, "to grasp something not already possessed." The last two of these are the more common, and the discussion below will attempt to outline these two more fully.

Examples of res rapta are hard to find in current discussion, since scholarship has failed to resolve the problems created by this interpretation. A large number of critics support the idea of pre-existence, a position which precludes the idea of Christ "snatching" something which was obviously already in His possession. Attempts at resolution usually involve modifying the sense of res rapta in some way. The results are similar to C. F. D. Moule's "Harpagmos in verse 6 is an abstract noun meaning 'the act of snatching'. . . 'he did not regard equality with God as consisting in snatching'" (emphasis author's).[1] Meyer refers harpagmos "to that moment, when the pre-existing Christ was on the point of coming into the world,"[2] considering the attitude he would take upon His Incarnation. The notion of Christ poised at the point of the Incarnation, considering His options, should probably be rejected, since we do not find this in the text. The text which speaks of harpagmos is probably simply stating negatively what is stated positively by heauton ekenosen.

Res retinenda has become the position of choice for many, since it seems to be the best resolution of a pre-existent "snatching." the view was set forth as early as Chrysostom:

> Whatsoever a man robs, and takes contrary to his right, he dares not lay aside, from fear lest it perish, and fall from his possession, but he keeps hold of it continually. He who possesses a dignity which is natural to him, fears not to descend from that dignity, being assured that nothing of this sort will happen to him.[3]

This statement has a touch of the res rapta viewpoint also, but clearly speaks the position of "letting go."

A customary way of defending the res retinenda view is to equate harpagmos with its cognate harpagma, for which many references may be found in the Septuagint. This noun form exhibits a fairly even distribution in meaning between "robbery" and "prey," indicating that it may have undergone a shift from one to include the other. Lightfoot gives a good treatment of these two terms as equals:

> Substantives in -mos are frequently used to describe a concrete thing. . . And again the particular word harpagmos occurs so rarely that usage cannot be decisive. . . . Under theses circumstances we may, in choosing between the two senses of harpagmos, fairly assign to it here the one which best suits the context. . . Though he pre-existed in the form of God, yet He did not look upon equality with God as a prize which must not slip from His grasp, but He emptied himself, divested himself, taking upon Him the form of a slave (emphasis author's).[4]

Objections are raised on the use of these terms interchangeably. C. F. D. Moule cites several instances of use of the terms in extra-biblical material, with the conclusion, "There appears to be no evidence that harpagmos, in particular, did, in fact, mean the same as harpagma."[5] But neither does he offer evidence to the contrary, leaving Lightfoot's suggestion a possibility. A. B. Bruce contends also, "If the Greek Fathers had not scruple in rendering the word as if it had been harpagma, this may be held to prove that no hard and fast line separates the active from the passive form as to sense."[6]

Objections have been raised against taking the res retinenda view altogether, since evidence speaks contrary to this meaning of harpagmos. Hoover, who perhaps does the most convincing analysis against res retinenda, lists extensive citations of non-biblical literature, with the conclusion,

> Neither in this idiomatic phrase nor in any other usage does harpagma, harpagmos, or harpazein, or any of their compounds or cognates mean to retain something. That idea, it appears, has always been commended by theological interest rather than by philological evidence (emphasis author's).[7]

Hoover bases his own interpretation on the understanding of morphe and isa, seeing them as "something already present and at one's disposal. The question in such instances is not whether or not one possesses something, but whether or not one chooses to exploit something"; thus his interpretation is, "'He did not regard being equal with God as something to take advantage of,' or, more idiomatically, 'as something to use for his own advantage.'"[8] His view might seem to place him outside conventional views, but in some ways it is simply a circumlocution. To take advantage of His status, He naturally would have had to be in possession of it; and to say that he did not take advantage of the status of being equal with God may be stated equally well by saying that he did not retain the advantages that went with the condition of equality. A. B. Bruce makes such a statement:

> The apostle's purpose is not formally to teach that Christ was truly God, so that it was not arrogance on His part to claim equality of nature with God; but rather to teach that he being God did not make a point of retaining the advantages connected with the divine state of being.[9]

Bruce rightly focuses on the humility and self-giving attitude that led toward the Incarnation. C. F. D. Moule's conclusion is based on the same consideration: "The point of the passage. . . is that, instead of imagining that equality with God meant getting, Jesus, on the contrary, gave--gave until he was 'empty'" (emphasis author's).[10]

Attempts have been made at some form of mediation between positions. Foerster's understanding seems to embrace both the retinenda position and Hoover's idea of taking advantage. "He did not regard equality with God as a gain, either in the sense of something not to be let slip, or in the sense of something not to be left unutilised."[11] Perhaps Foerster simply takes for

granted what has already been suggested, that Hoover's view is simply a modified version of res retinenda. One might object, though, to Foerster's use of the word "gain," since it would be unclear how one in possession of equality could consider this a "gain" (at least in the usual sense of something added). Barrett attempts to reconcile positions at a different level:

> For Christ equality with God was both res rapta and res rapienda. As the eternal Son of God, he had it; yet emptied himself and became obedient (cf. II Cor. viii.9). As Man, the new Adam, he had it not; yet did not snatch at it, but chose rather the life of obedient and dependent creatureliness for which God made him.[12]

Summary

Definite conclusions are hard to arrive at in light of the absence of comparison passages in Scripture. Cognate usage may shed some light, but only seems to fuel the fire of controversy over the reliability of such an approach. Prior context must be one of the strongest determining factors in this situation. Paul's exhortation to humility, counteracting the opposite attitude of self-seeking pride, is the focus which precedes and precipitates the discussion of this hymn, a focus which is made clearer by the antithetical relation of "harpagmos-ekenosen." Thus the interpretation of harpagmos is tied to both the theme of humility/humiliation and the meaning of ekenosen. Perhaps another understanding of ekenosen, common to Paul, may carry some meaning for the interpretation of harpagmos. As Wright declares,

> Ekenosen does not refer to the loss of divine attributes, but--in good Pauline fashion--to making something powerless, emptying it of significance. The real humiliation of the incarnation and the cross is that one who was himself God, and who never during the whole process stopped being God, could embrace such a vocation. The real theological emphasis of the hymn, therefore, is not simply a new view of Jesus. It is a new understanding of God. . . . incarnation and even crucifixion are to be seen as appropriate vehicles for the dynamic self-revelation of God. . . . If we read the hymn as I have suggested the paraenetic significance does not stop with v. 8, as Martin

> suggests, but continues all through. God himself recognizes and endorses self-abnegation as the proper expression of divine character (emphasis author's).[13]

Whichever interpretation is preferred, the idea of humility cannot be ignored as the key focus intended. Wright expresses it well as "self-abnegation"; C. F. D. Moule expresses much the same with the idea of "giving rather than getting"; Lightfoot describes it as "divested Himself"; and Hoover even falls into the same category with "not taking advantage."

Wright perhaps carries the extent of the implications to their fullest. His suggestion of "making powerless" as the meaning of the "emptying" opens other avenues of thought. If doulos was chosen as the antithesis to kyrios, then the idea of being "equal with God" could also be an expression of a concept of God's power. What Christ chose not to exploit may not have been the advantages or prerogatives of Deity, but the exercise of power. He chose instead to take the powerless position of a slave, who has no rights, becoming obedient rather than using His position as the One in authority who would instead expect obedience from others. The depth of this humility and obedience was reached in the death on a cross, usually the death suffered by the lowest of slaves and criminals. This type of thought certainly seems to fit the context well, and is well worth further consideration.

An objection may be raised, though, that the idea of making Himself powerless, in connection with kenoo, which may signify "empty," would suggest that Christ "emptied" Himself of power. This emptying seems to indicate an emphasis upon the voluntariness of the act, rather than on the negation of power. Besides, Christ was not powerless during the Incarnation by any means. He had "authority on earth to forgive sins" (Mt. 9:6); He gave the disciples "authority to cast out demons" (Mk. 3:15, 6:7); "the power of the Lord was with Him to heal" (Lk. 5:17); He said, "I have power to lay [my life] down, and I have power to take it up again." In all fairness to Wright, he does follow the emphasis on the "self-abnegation," but this emphasis is clear from the text and need not necessarily follow his conclusion

about the interpretation of kenoo. Perhaps the choice of Christ in relation to "power" involved the exercise of that power.

CHAPTER FOUR NOTES

1 C. F. D. Moule, "Further Reflexions," 266.

2 Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and to Philemon, (N. Y.: Funk & Wagnalls, 1885), 69.

3 Chrysostom, 76.

4 Lightfoot, 111.

5 C. F. D. Moule, "Further Reflexions," 267.

6 A. B. Bruce, 366.

7 Hoover, 118-19.

8 Ibid., 118.

9 A. B. Bruce, 17.

10 C. F. D. Moule, "Further Reflexions," 272.

11 Werner Foerster, "Harpagmos," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Vol. 1, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 474.

12 C. K. Barrett, From First Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology, (N. Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962), 72.

13 Wright, "Harpagmos and the Meaning of Philippians 2:5-11," 345-47.

CHAPTER FIVE
Authorship of the Hymn

A key question that must be dealt with in practically any analysis of this passage is whether Paul was indeed the author or is quoting a previously existing hymn. The idea of Pauline authorship has recently been heavily criticized, and commentators have been reluctant to support the position outright. Much work has surfaced in the last several years, however, and though with some reluctance, a number of writers offer strong evidence that Pauline authorship should be reconsidered. A discussion and evaluation of the critical attention given to this subject is well merited in light of a basic premise of the present work, that "Whether the hymn is Paul's or not, the placing of it at this point is designed to drive home the ethical injunction."[1]

Influences

One of the first questions that must be addressed involves the possible presence of background influences upon composition.[2] The most commonly suggested influence is the Second Adam theme. This theme is distinctly Pauline in nature: "The Last Adam motif is characteristic of St. Paul who, alone of New Testament writers, uses it. . . this, surely, makes it more difficult to deny that the Apostle may have composed these lines."[3] The presence of this theme certainly lends strong credibility to the idea of Pauline authorship, but if so, also indicates that the passage probably needs to be balanced against the related passages in I Cor. 15:45-49 and Rom. 5:12-21.

Other writers look to alternate sources, such as Semitic poetry. Martin cites Lohmeyer as being the first to suggest the idea of a Semitic original, with the conclusion that "The poet's mother-tongue was Semitic."[4] Paul could certainly be characterized as an author with that qualification. Marshall adds that "the fact of translation into Greek would account for the unusual vocabulary and the unusual employment of Pauline words in the hymn."[5]

But is the hymn indeed a translation from a Semitic original? The answer is certainly not clear. Despite the best attempts to prove the point, says Feinberg, "All retranslations have failed."[6] These problems with retranslation reside on the side of the Greek and not the Aramaic. For example, O'Brien quotes Deichgraber, who found "eight expressions that were difficult to imagine as translations from a Semitic original."[7] A concurring opinion adds that the "Greek is not translation Greek."[8]

Must the hymn be characterized as "pre-Pauline"? J. A. Sanders says that even if the hymn were proven to have had an independent existence before Paul wrote this epistle, "We are still dependent on Paul alone for its form, content, context, and significance."[9] With this in mind, several lines of thought will be pursued relevant to the matter of authorship, in matters of structure, language, theology, and context.

Structure

There is considerable agreement among scholars that this passage is indeed a hymn. The work of Lohmeyer is still recognized by most, with his division into six strophes of three lines each. To fit his pattern, he made some excisions of Pauline "glosses," the most notable being thanatou de staurou.[10] Since his work was published, the hymnic structure has gained acceptance, but not necessarily Lohmeyer's analysis of it. Several attempts have been made to render the poetic features more satisfactorily, with different ideas as to the number of strophes and the number of lines within them.[11]

With all the disagreement over the structure, can the passage really be described with any certainty as a "hymn"? On detecting hymns in Scripture, Caird says, "In the Pauline Epistles the undertaking is exceedingly precarious in view of Paul's propensity to break forth into lyrical and rhythmical prose."[12] Caird's statement finds support from many quarters, usually with I Cor. 13 cited as support of the thought.[13] The

suggestion seems to be that even if these verses can be shown to be a hymn, it does not necessarily preclude Pauline authorship.

On Lohmeyer's suggestions of Pauline "glosses," F. F. Bruce tells us,

> Any attempt to establish this theory by the argument that the structure is smoother without the alleged additions is futile: the composition follows no strict poetical pattern, either Greek or Semitic, and arrangements which preserve the alleged additions are just as persuasive as others which omit them.[14]

Indeed, the great variety and persuasiveness of the different arrangements can be confusing and frustrating. One arrangement can be just as convincing as another, perhaps giving credibility to Caird's suggestion of "rhythmical prose." Hooker, not satisfied simply to say, "The passage as we have it never really fits the patterns into which the commentators try to push it," makes the extraordinarily bold statement, "I suspect that often those who analyse the lines have decided which words are Pauline glosses before they start their poetic analysis."[15]

Whether the passage may be said to be a hymn or not is not a major question when dealing with Pauline authorship. Paul certainly had the capability of being extremely poetic, as seen in I Cor. 13. On the other hand, the disagreement on the exact structure of the hymn, if it is one, does not preclude the thought that it may derive from a hymnic original. Such disagreement does leave doubt that the verses were written in a poetic or hymnic fashion. Overall, much of the critical analysis reflects "uncertainty of the stylistic criteria, the number and content of the strophes in vv. 6-11, the possible Pauline additions, and thus the questions as to whether the hymn was constructed according to a strict scheme at all."[16]

Language

Many of the arguments against Pauline authorship involve a rejection of the language of the hymn. The greatest objection by far is that of the hapax legomena present in the passage. Furness notes and answers some of these objections:

> Three words, harpagmos, hyperupsoun, and kataxhthonios do not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, and the first of these is extremely rare in profane Greek. Morphe is elsewhere used once only in the New Testament, at Mk. 16:12. Paul uses kenoun four times elsewhere in his writings, but always in the sense "make void," which cannot be its meaning here. Taylor observes: "The argument from hapax legomena does not carry us far, for there are other passages in the Pauline Epistles of equal length in which as many words of the kind can be found." One might instance the elegant "hymn of love" in I Co. 13 which, to a cursory examination, reveals three words which do not occur elsewhere in the New Testament (including one which is extremely rare in secular Greek), and three which occur elsewhere in the New Testament only in non-Pauline texts. In any case, it should be borne in mind that this is poetry (or at the very least, rhetorical prose), in which we normally expect to find the unusual word or phrase used for heightened effect.[17]

His comparison of this passage to the Corinthian passage, a common consideration, is one of the more pertinent comments in this discussion. The presence of hapax legomena and non-Pauline words in another passage of poetry (or exalted prose) is a valid argument on the side of Pauline authorship--or at least, a refutation of the arguments against Pauline authorship on these grounds. Caird notes:

> Now it is true that the passage contains three hapax legomena and one word used in an unusual sense. But one of the hapax legomena is a compound word of a kind that Paul delighted to create, and several of the other words in the passage are typically Pauline. Moreover, Philippians has a higher proportion of hapax legomena than any other Pauline Epistle. The linguistic evidence, therefore, is by no means incompatible with Pauline authorship.[18]

The compound that "Paul delighted to create" is found in verse nine, hyperupsosen, and Caird adds, "Paul uses in his Epistles no less than 20 compounds with hyper."[19] Further investigation reveals that many, if not most, of these hyper compounds are also either hapax legomena or found only in Paul. As for the compound found here, it is found nowhere else in the New Testament, but several times in the Septuagint. This discovery, along with other Septuagint hints, might lend support to the idea of an Old Testament mooring for the hymn.[20]

Another linguistic objection involves the name that was "given" to Christ at His exaltation. Many critics wish to avoid the possibility of viewing the bestowal of this name as a "reward," implying to the believer the idea of a "religion of works" (cf. Eph. 1:8). But since the word itself is a cognate of Paul's common expression for "grace," perhaps the word was carefully chosen for the exact purpose of avoiding any idea of reward. It may be argued further that the concept of reward, though in a modified form, is not foreign to Paul (see, e.g., I Cor. 9:24-27).

The point needs to be made that perhaps linguistic arguments are not entirely valid in their own right. O'Brien proposes, "We do not have sufficient material of the apostle's on a wide range of subjects to come to definite conclusions regarding the hymn's authorship; expert linguists claim that a ten thousand-word sampling from an author is usually necessary for making reliable decisions."[21] The point is well taken, but we are still faced with the task of trying to make whatever determinations we can from our existing material. And in the New Testament, perhaps no better sampling is found for any other writer than Paul.

Theology

Many objections have been raised concerning the theology of the passage. The discussion here has centered on two fronts: the presence of ideas foreign to Pauline thought, and the absence of expected themes, particularly the Resurrection. Martin sums up the arguments well, listing the foreign ideas as the thought of Jesus as equal with God, Jesus designated as doulos, Christ receiving a "gift" from God, and the three-fold division of the cosmos. He mentions the Resurrection, the saving significance of the Cross, and the place of the Church in this framework as themes that we might expect to find in Paul.[22] Porter emphasizes that the incarnation was "a supreme act of love toward men. . . . The entire absence of this motive in the poem is the chief reason for the conviction that Paul could not have written it."[23]

These objections by no means receive welcome approval or acceptance. The possible reflection of Second Adam themes, if accepted, would provide definite Pauline theological concerns to the passage. Nowhere does the hymn definitely speak of "equality with God" as something Christ already possesses, and the idea of Christ as servant is not entirely foreign to Paul.

The absence of Pauline ideas is more easily answered. The most clear-cut argument is to reject an "approach that makes the absence of certain ideas a determining criterion in matters of authorship."[24] Certainly Paul cannot be expected, in a passage no longer than this, to have included every single theological concern he may have. True, the subject matter does seem to anticipate some themes that do not materialize, but this still need not militate against Pauline authorship. These absences may be explained by consideration of the intent and flow of the passage. For instance, the absence of direct comment on the saving significance of the Cross could signify that "the apostle's intent was to show what Christ's obedience meant for him, not for us" (emphasis author's).[25] As to objections concerning the exaltation, Hooker counters,

> It has been argued that the omission of a specific reference to the resurrection is un-Pauline; here all the emphasis is on the idea of exaltation. But Paul certainly speaks elsewhere of Christ's exaltation following the resurrection; Rom. 8:34 and I Cor. 15:27, for example, both speak of Christ's exaltation and reign, and it is perhaps significant that these two passages are both found in "Second Adam" contexts.[26]

As already mentioned in the "Limitations" of this effort, objections have been raised concerning the inclusion of the exaltation portion in the hymn at all. Martin cites Jervell's explanation of the problem, "Paul is quoting--as is evident--as the hymn cuts short his presentation. As a matter of fact, only verses 6-8 are necessary to illustrate the exhortation in verses 2-3; but because Paul had a hymn in front of him he continues with verses 9-11."[27] The problem need not be understood in this way, since Paul sometimes exhibits a tendency to "break into doxology, even when it interrupts the flow of thought."[28] Also,

as will be considered in the next section on "Context," the place of the exaltation in the exhortation, as well as the place of the Church in the thought of the passage may well be explained by the context following the hymn.

The argument from omission thus seems less plausible than other objections to Pauline authorship. The definite presence of Pauline theological concerns is a little more difficult to show. A better description of the passage is that it "ambiguously illustrates Paul's own thought and terminology."[29] This ambiguity may be explained by the fact that the concern at hand is hortatory and not Christological. Pauline theological concerns are not at the forefront, rather they seem to be presupposed in their expression within the hymn. This explains the difficulty in pinpointing Pauline themes and theology with any certainty.

Context

One of the must undeniable features of the hymn is its place within the context in the epistle. So many similarities exist in relation to the surrounding verses, that context becomes a primary focus in determining authorship. Attempts to divorce the hymn from its present context to determine some "original meaning" only serve to skew the intent of Paul. Thus the reader may be surprised at Martin's comment, "Once the hymn's significance in its original form is detached form the use Paul makes of it, we are relieved of these irritating difficulties of interpretation."[30] This statement, if it is to be taken to mean what it appears to mean, seems to disregard context and authorial intent. And even though "authorial intent" is not always an exact undertaking, the context both preceding and following the hymn gives a clear indication of what Paul was doing with this admonition.

One component of some of the attempts to separate the hymn from the context involves a separation between verses four and five. Kaesemann cites Lohmeyer, who holds that "grammatically

the demonstrative pronoun never points ahead to a relative clause in Paul."[31] Porter answers this objection on logical and contextual grounds.

> There have been various efforts to weaken the connection between the four verses [Phil. 2:1-4] and the unexpected picture with which Paul apparently means to illustrate and enforce them. . . . With so unmistakable an introduction it would be a totally unjustifiable procedure to assume that Paul turns to Christology, and undertakes to answer the question. . . how the pre-existent divine Christ became man. Paul is repeating the hymn not in order to explain the peculiarity of Christ's nature, that which separates him from man, but to put before his reader's eyes the Christ whom they are to imitate, whose mind he has just defined.[32]

The focus, however, is not entirely on the paraenetic concerns that tie text and context. Robbins notes that the structure of the first sentence following the hymn "divides in precisely the same way as the passage under consideration. It is not so exalted or rhythmic or poetic as our passage, but it has the same periodic structure."[33] But more germane to the issue of authorship is the subject of linguistic parallels of text and context. Hooker insists,

> Whatever the origin of Phil. 2:6-11, the passage belongs in its present context. Its vocabulary echoes that of the verses immediately preceding. It is introduced in verse 5 with the verb <u>phroneite</u>, which echoes <u>phronete</u> and <u>phronoutes</u> [sic] in verse 2. The important word <u>etapeinosen</u> in verse 8 picks up the term <u>tapeinophrosune</u> in verse 3. The verses are also firmly anchored in their context by what comes immediately after. In verse 12 Paul begins the next section with the word <u>hoste</u>--and when he writes <u>hoste</u> elsewhere it is because there is a logical progression in his thought, not because he considers it a suitable weak link word; in this case it is <u>hoste hypekousate</u>--echoing the <u>hypekoos</u> of verse 8. Thus four times over Paul links the behaviour of the Philippians (or rather the behaviour which he expects of them) with the behaviour of Christ himself, described in verses 6-8.[34]

Strimple also notes several of these, and adds the following: <u>ekenosen</u> (v. 7) and <u>kenodoxian</u> (v. 3); <u>heuretheis</u> (v. 7) and <u>heuretho</u> (3:9); <u>echarisato</u> (v. 9) and <u>echaristhe</u> (1:29); <u>eis</u>

doxan theou patros (v. 11) and eis doxan...theou (1:11).[35] Added to this may be the observation that Paul speaks in verse seventeen of being "poured out," a link at least in thought if not in actual word, of ekenosen in verse seven. With such an array of linguistic and thematic parallels, the possibility of Pauline authorship is strengthened.[36]

A considerably well thought out response is made by Hooker to a couple of objections to Pauline authorship. In relating the connection of the hymn to chapter three, she contends, beginning from verse twenty,

> At this point there is a whole cluster of words which occurred in the hymn and its immediate context: politeuma, citizenship, echoes the cognate verb used in i. 17; we have also hyparchei, kyrios, compounds of schema and morphe, tapeinosis, doxa, ta panta. But more important even than the language is the theme. . . . in Christ the Christian shares in the reversal of status which took place when God raised him. Christ now works our transformation through the power given to him in his ascension. It cannot be accidental that this is stated in terms which so clearly echo the language of the hymn. It is almost as though Paul wrote: Christ humbled himself, becoming man, in order that by his humiliation we might become glorious in him.
>
> This, then, would seem to be Paul's distinctive interpretation of the meaning of Christ's humiliation and exaltation for those in Christ. And if in Philippians he has used a non-Pauline hymn, then perhaps we have an insight into the way in which he took over material and gave it his own characteristic twist: for we seem to see him taking the theme and language of the hymn and working out its application (emphasis author's).[37]

This understanding provides an answer to the difficulties posed by the place of the exaltation in the exhortation, and by the absence of the place of the believer in the passage. Paul has simply taken a circuitous route in developing the entire point of the passage as it relates to himself and to the believers in Philippi. In 3:8, he expresses his own self-emptying by "For his sake I have suffered the loss of all things, and I regard them as rubbish, in order that I may gain Christ." This statement follows his "confidence in the flesh" (v. 4), suggesting that this "loss" involved everything in his life that had meant

anything to him until Christ: his heritage and his loyal Hebrew standing. His comment in verse twelve--"Not that I have already obtained this or have already reached the goal; but I press on to make it my own, because Christ Jesus has made me his own"--perhaps is an expression to relieve the tension of the dialectic found in his understanding of what it means to be "in Christ." Then in verse seventeen Paul turns the imitatio concept back to his traditional rendering, that of "imitating me," so that the entire paraenetic context properly may be said to begin at 1:27 and carry through to at least 4:1, where he concludes with another characteristic use of hoste.

Some further comment may be made on the shift of thought that occurs from the preceding context to that which follows the passage. Paul begins by exhorting humility (v. 3) and then picks up the flow of thought with obedience (v. 12). This shift in thought occurs at verse eight within the hymn, where Christ is said to "humble Himself" and "become obedient." Because Paul in verse twelve essentially picks up this exhortation after verse eight, many critics seem to have picked up the shift and focused on the idea of obedience as Paul's central intentional focus of the exhortation. Both should be maintained as part of the exhortation: the attitude of humility is urged as the essential characteristic to be desired toward the action of obedience. Others have understood the passage on exaltation as irrelevant to the exhortation. Extending the bounds of the exhortation as Hooker has done opens the door for a wider consideration of what Paul does with the hymn. Thus, if any passage may be said to interrupt the flow from 1:27-4:1, it would be 2:19-30 (perhaps even 3:1), the comments on Timothy and Epaphroditus.

Summary

What conclusions may be drawn from the focus of this chapter? Perhaps a shift in the current thinking against Pauline authorship may be in order. Since the work of Lohmeyer and those who have followed his thinking in making this hymn a pre-Pauline

composition, the tendency has been to pre-suppose Lohmeyer's position, and cast a shadow upon opinions to the contrary. The result has been to shift the burden of proof to those who support Pauline authorship. Yet a strong case may be made for Pauline authorship on the following grounds: the abundance of linguistic parallels; the general flow of thought with its paraenetic concerns; the thematic and possible other parallels in Pauline thought; and particularly after the above considerations, the appearance of the hymn within the context of a Pauline epistle.

The case may be made that an assumption of authorship is typically the case of passages which appear within any author's writing. Even those who categorically deny Pauline authorship typically speak of the hymn as though he wrote it.[38] (Equally typical of this type of assumption is the present work which, though not accepting without reservation the idea that the passage is indeed a "hymn," makes reference to it as such, for ease of reference.) Despite all the arguments and counter-arguments on the matter, perhaps Hooker's premise is the most accurate: "Even if the material is pre-Pauline, we may expect Paul himself to have interpreted it and used it in a Pauline manner."[39]

CHAPTER FIVE NOTES

1 T. Francis Glasson, "Two Notes on the Philippians Hymn (II. 6-11)," New Testament Studies 21 (Oct. 1974): 138.

2 Questions of influence will be dealt with at greater length in chapter six.

3 J. M. Furness, "Behind the Philippian Hymn," 242.

4 Martin, Carmen Christi, 46.

5 I. Howard Marshall, "The Christ-Hymn in Philippians 2:5-11: A Review Article," Tyndale Bulletin 19 (1968): 120.

6 Feinberg, 39.

7 O'Brien, 199.

8 F. F. Bruce, "St. Paul in Macedonia. 3. The Philippian Correspondence," Bulletin of the J. Rylands Library 63 (Spring 1981): 269.

9 J. A. Sanders, "Dissenting Deities and Philippians 2:1-11," Journal of Biblical Literature 88 (Sep. 1969): 290.

10 In Kyrios Jesus, cited by Martin, Carmen Christi, 25ff.

11 Lohmeyer's arrangement (cited in Martin, Carmen Christi, 40) offers six strophes of three lines each; J. Jeremias (cited in Charles J. Fobbins, "Rhetorical Structure of Philippians 2:6-11," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 42 [Jan. 1980], 81) divides it into six couplets of two lines each, while making three excisions of "glosses": Robbins (73) suggests twelve lines divided into four groups; Hooker (From Adam to Christ, 94-95) offers an interesting arrangement of twenty lines divided into a 6-4-4-6 pattern.

12 G. B. Caird, The Apostolic Age, (London: Gerald Duckworth, 1955), 114.

13 See, e.g., L. Cerfaux, Christ in the Theology of Saint Paul, trans. Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker, (New York: Herder & Herder, 1959), p. 376-77; W. K. Lowther Clarke, New Testament Problems: Essays-Reviews-Interpretations, (New York: MacMillan, 1929), p. 145; Furness, "Behind the Philippian Hymn," p. 178; and Frank Chamberlain Porter, The Mind of Christ in Paul: Light from Paul on Present Problems of Christian Thinking, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930), pp. 206-7.

14 F. F. Bruce, 269.

15 Hocker, From Adam to Christ, 94

16 O'Brien, 199.

17 J. M. Furness, "The Authorship of Philippians ii. 6-11," Expository Times 70, No. 8 (May 1959): 240-41. The work he cites by Vincent Taylor is The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching, p. 63.

18 Caird, 114.

19 Ibid., n. 5.

20 It must be noted, however, that the Hebrew, rather than the Septuagint, is the source of comparison. For the "other Septuagint hints," see the discussion in chapter six.

21 O'Brien, 199.

22 Martin, Carmen Christi, 48-51.

23 Porter, 212.

24 O'Brien, 200.

25 Ibid.

26 Hooker, From Adam to Christ, 99.

27 Martin, Carmen Christi, 288-89, n. 2.

28 Frank Stagg, "The Mind in Christ Jesus: Philippians 1:27-2:18," Review and Expositor 77 (Summer 1980): 345.

29 Norman K. Bakken, "The New Humanity: Christ and the Modern Age. A Study Centering in the Christ-Hymn: Philippians 2:6-11," Interpretation 22 (Jan. 1968): 76.

30 Martin, Carmen Christi, 289.

31 Kaesemann, 84. Kaesemann, however, rejects the conclusions reached by Lohmeyer.

32 Porter, 208-9.

33 Robbins, 81.

34 Hooker, From Adam to Christ, 89-90.

35 Robert B. Strimple, "Philippians 2:5-11 in Recent Studies: Some Exegetical Conclusions," Westminster Theological Journal 41 (Spring 1979): 249.

36 Martin (Carmen Christi, 59) suggests that Paul may have simply adapted his vocabulary to that of the hymn. If this were the case, it probably involves an assumption of a carefully

considered structure or approach to the writing of the epistle itself. To assume that Paul does not thus adapt the language of the context, however, would likely mean that the similarity of language in text and context reflects the natural flow of composition that would occur if Paul composed the "hymn" as he wrote/dictated. Either assumption has its own difficulty.

37 M. D. Hooker, "Interchange in Christ," Journal of Theological Studies, n.s. 22 (Oct. 1971): 357.

38 E.g., Ralph Martin, Carmen Christi, 37, in contesting the ethical interpretation, rejoins with, "If Paul were simply inculcating an acceptance of humility on the ground that Christ was humble, why does he go on to speak of Christ's triumph and honour?"

39 Hooker, From Adam to Christ, 89.

CHAPTER SIX
Influences on Composition

Many theories have been set forth concerning factors that may have influenced composition of the hymn. These factors must be considered, as they have a direct bearing on interpretation. The main lines of thought that will be covered here are the Second Adam theory and the Servant of Yahweh theory, with a brief examination of the suggestion of a Gnostic influence.

The Second Adam Theory

The most common suggestion of a strong influence on the passage is the contrast between Adam and Christ. The strongest contention in support of the theory involves the interpretation of "form of God" (morphe) as a synonym of "image" (eikon), making the interpretation of "form of God" an equivalent of the "image of God" in which Adam was created (Gen. 1:26). James Dunn, a strong proponent of the theory, also compares "equality with God" with the temptation of both Adam and Christ, so that only Christ's earthly life is involved in the hymn's focus.[1]

A strong ground for consideration of the Adam contrast is its foundation in Pauline thought elsewhere. Paul deals explicitly with the idea in Rom. 5:12-21 and in I Cor. 15:45-49. The thoughts expressed in these passages, though not necessarily explicit in the wording of the hymn, are seen as the thoughts behind the author's language. For those who support this idea, two common contrasts are noted, "The contrast between 'self-exaltation' and 'humiliation' and that between 'disobedience' and obedience.'"[2] To these two, Harvey adds his observation of a third, the resulting exaltation of Christ versus the expulsion of Adam and Eve from the garden.[3] Harvey's discussion of the theory leaves a little to be desired at two points: he speaks of "the difficulty of communicating to modern man through this passage, when he no longer accepts such ideas as pre-existence," adding, "What was in Paul's mind as he

wrote. . . is not of existential importance to us."[4] The question must be raised as to the basis of the first statement, and the second is doubtful if authorial intent is to have any meaning at all.

As has already been suggested, a major foundation of the Second Adam theory is the interpretation of key terms. In addition to the equivalency of "form" with "image" and "equality with God" with the temptation, Dunn bases much on the interpretation of hos anthropos. It is, he says, a picture of "Christ evaluated theologically as Adam: his life proved him to be in form as man. Notice, not 'as a man,' but as man--that is, as representative man, as one with fallen man, as Adam" (emphasis author's).[5] Another key to the contrast is the interpretation of what is meant by harpagmos.

> The starting-off point for the interpretation of this passage as a contrast between Christ and Adam has always been the res rapienda interpretation of the word harpagmos: Christ did not regard equality with God as something to be grasped. This has been seen as a deliberate contrast with the attempt of Adam in Gen. 3 to grasp at an equality which he did not possess. If we accept the res rapta interpretation, on the other hand, and regard equality as something which Christ did not cling to, then this particular contrast cannot be maintained.[6]

Thus most supporters of this view hold to the res rapienda view, since the contrast is usually focused on the idea of Christ's earthly life, a focus which negates res rapta.

Most supporters are not so bold to speak of the Second Adam influence as Dunn, who views the presence of the contrast as "dominant," that "Christ's earthly life was an embodiment of grace from beginning to end, of giving away in contrast to the selfish grasping of Adam's sin, that every choice of any consequence made by Christ was the antithesis of Adam's."[7] This is a strong assertion and may be one reason most opponents of the theory find it necessary to deal with Dunn's work, along with the fact that his is perhaps the most cogent expression of the hypothesis.

The theory certainly is not without opposition, at several

points. Many reject the theory on the grounds that the passage must refer to the pre-existence of Christ, and thus its proponents ignore the occurrence of the exchange of form. Glasson objects, "The Son of God exchanged one mode of being for another; instead of the morphe of God, the morphe of a slave. This lifts the term right away from the Adam story."[8] Whether this objection need necessarily destroy the theory is unclear, since the discussion by Paul in I Cor. 15:47 refers to Christ, "The second man is from heaven" (v. 47). The common means of getting around the problem is to support the idea of Christ as a pre-existent "God-man."[9] (This idea will be covered further in chapter eight.) O'Brien objects to the equivalence of morphe with eikon: "Certainly Adam is nowhere in the LXX or the NT referred to as morphe theou."[10] In fact, very little usage of morphe is attested in the Septuagint at all. What little is found offers little support for a comparison with eikon.

> The exegetical identification of Phil. 2:6 with Gen. 1:26, 27 then rests on the identification of demut and selem with morphe. Examination of the use of morphe in the LXX will show that it never translates demut and renders selem only once. . . . On the other hand, eikon translates five Heb words, selem being the most common. It renders demut only once.

It may be suggested that the scarcity of use of morphe in the Septuagint (twelve times) may not allow conclusions to be made with any certainty.

A point may be made here that part of the reason for the res rapta interpretation of harpagmos is the recognition that Christ "being in the form of God" cannot be said to think of "grasping" that which is already in his possession. This interpretation is probably an attempt by interpreters to resolve an old problem with the AV rendering, "robbery." Such a resolution need not destroy the contrast between Adam/Christ outright if it is viewed as a modification of the other problem. However, it must also be recognized that this interpretation of harpagmos presupposes the idea of pre-existence, which has already been shown to create problems for the Second Adam theory. "Vv. 6-7 are very odd if the person referred to had never been anything other than a human

being. The contrast. . . is thus made most effectively if Christ is understood to have renounced the rank and privileges to which he had. . . every right."[12] Wright's understanding of harpagmos thus leads him to refer to Adam/Christ as a contrast, but not a parallel. "The temptation of Christ was not to snatch at a forbidden equality with God, but to cling to his rights and thereby opt out of the task allotted to him, that he should undo the results of Adam's snatching."[13]

The "negative formulation" of the harpagmos statement is the key to the Second Adam interpretation. Interpreters see in this statement of "what Christ did not do" the shadow of what was involved in the snatching of Adam. The inference is not necessarily clear. Foerster suggests, "The negative formulation is readily understandable, for it is a great gain to be equal with God and 'everyone' would utilise it. In justification of the negative formulation, therefore, we do not need think of the fall of Adam."[14] It is perhaps not too far-fetched to see in Dunn's idea of Christ as "representative man" the antithesis to Foerster's "everyone." More likely, though, is the idea that the negative expression of this thought is designed to point out the behavior of the Philippians in contrast to the behavior Paul seeks to exhort in the passage: they are to see themselves in his words.

A different approach to denying Second Adam postulations is taken by Hudson, who argues, "The clue has been taken from two other letters of Paul which have a completely different field of reference. This passage forms part of an appeal for humility and like-mindedness, which is very different from the contexts in Romans and I Corinthians."[15] Hudson's statement about the focus on humility may be applied in another direction as well. The focus of many, if not most, of the comments on the theory by its supporters is on the obedience-disobedience contrast, which takes it away from Paul's general thought of the exhortation, namely humility.

What conclusions may be drawn from the arguments and counter-arguments of this theory? Dunn insists, "Since the

thought is dominated by the Adam/Christ parallel and contrast, the individual expressions must be understood in that context."[16] But the hints of this contrast found in the hymn are less than "dominant," so that in reality, "The figure of Adam lurks in the background"[17] (a comment Dunn actually intends in support of his contention). Attempts to make the passage a parallel of Paul's use of Second Adam discussions are not entirely successful, since the theme is not in the forefront. Perhaps the best view of the place of the theory is, "The parallel, if there is one. . . is one of thought, rather than of expression."[18]

The Servant of Yahweh Theory

Another popular suggestion for the background ideas of the passage involves a comparison with the Servant Songs of Isaiah, particularly Isaiah 53. The comparison involves several linguistic parallels between the two. Stanley points out the following: heauton ekenosen (Phil. 2:7) with kenos ekopiasa (Isa. 49:4); hyperupsosen (Phil. 2:9) with hypsothesetai (Isa. 52:13); and dio (Phil. 2:9) with dia touto (Isa. 53:12).[19] To these, Hunter adds etapeinosen heauton (Phil. 2:8) with tapeinose (Isa. 53:8); mechri thanatou (Phil. 2:8) with eis thanaton (Isa. 53:8); and the semi-direct quote of Isa. 45:23 found in Phil. 2:10-11.[20] Investigation of the two passages has thus produced some striking linguistic similarities. Wright uses the passage in tandem with the Second Adam contrast. "When we find. . . a figure whose obedience undoes the disobedience of Adam, and who is then exalted to glory and honour, we are looking straight at the pattern of Israel's humiliation and exaltation in Isaiah 40-55."[21]

Objections to the theory are based mainly on linguistic grounds also. The most notable of these is to the suggestion that doulos (used in Phil.) is the equivalent of the pais of the Septuagint. "The primary objection. . . is that the LXX renders the Hebrew ebed with pais, a title of dignity and honour, whereas doulos by contrast underscores the elements of shame and

humiliation."[22] These objections echo the same sort of objections voiced earlier against equating morphe and eikon (chapter three). Another linguistic objection is offered by Hooker, "While kenoo is a possible translation of arah, it is not used in this sense in the LXX, nor is its primary meaning in this passage the actual death of Christ."[23]

Other criticisms of the theory are theologically grounded. The one most often voiced takes exception to "the virtual absence (so it is alleged) of any references to the Servant passages in the epistles of Paul."[24] Others refer not only to the idea that the Servant passages receive no notice, but that Paul nowhere refers to Jesus as a servant. Martin offers his own views in rejecting the Servant Songs:

> (i) It is strange that no soteriological value is attributed to the Lord's obedience and death in the Philippians passage; and (ii), while obedience is a theme in the hymn, it is left an open question as to how he was obedient. We naturally assume that it was the Father's will he accepted, but the hymn does not say so explicitly, whereas in Isa. 53 (cf. 50:4-7) the ebed acts in direct response to Yahweh's command (emphasis author's).[25]

And lastly, the objections fall into the category of logical problems with the theory. Feinberg objects, "This interpretation introduces the cross too soon in the Philippian hymn, the cross coming even before the incarnation."[26] That is, if "poured himself out (usually compared with 'emptying') unto death" is equated with the "emptying himself," then a tension is created by the interjection of "becoming obedient" before the death on the cross occurs. Bornkamm offers another disagreement, "There [in Isa. 53] the Servant of God in his nature and work is differentiated precisely from men. . . Here, however. . . his servant-form. . . places him in solidarity with men."[27]

The evidence from linguistic parallels is solid, though not overwhelming. But may the objections be satisfactorily answered? At least some of them have been countered very well. The work of Zimmerli and Jeremias answers to the comparison of doulos and pais:

> The connexion of Phil. 2:6-11 with Isa. 53 becomes

> plain as soon as it is recognized that not the LXX but the Heb. text of Isa. 53 is used; even the use of doulos (instead of pais) loses its strangeness. . . when it is recognized that we have here a direct rendering of the Hebrew ebed (Isa. 52:13). The decisive proof of the connexion of Phil. 2:6-11 with Isa. 53 lies in the fact that the expression heauton ekenosen (Phil. 2:7), attested nowhere else in the Greek and grammatically extremely harsh, is an exact rendering of he'erah naphsho (Isa. 53:12). Apart from other verbal echoes, allusion to Isa. 53 is to be seen further in the antithesis of extreme meekness and exaltation, in the willingness to be humbled and in the mention of obedience and of death.[28]

A check of the Septuagint use of both doulos and pais indicates that both are overwhelmingly rendered from the Hebrew ebed. At best, this information would back the above suggestion that they are used interchangeably. At least, it might indicate that the Hebrew simply carried no distinction such as some writers attempt to indicate from Septuagint usage.

Another suggestion on the use of these two words is offered by Feinberg. "The writer of the hymn might prefer doulos, since pais may have come to indicate a position of dignity which would not provide the antithesis to 'the name that is above every name.'"[29] An examination of the Septuagint usage does not show that this is true, since Gen. 9:25 speaks of the "lowest of slaves" (pais) and there are other indications of the more negative side of the term. Usage of the terms in Isaiah tends to shed a little more light, and may be the key to understanding the meaning for the passage in question. Pais is used exclusively by Isaiah in the positive sense of the word, usually in the form of the expression "servant of the Lord" (only Isa. 24:2 is a possible exception). Doulos, on the other hand, can carry either sense of the word. In 42:19, both words appear to be used in the same sense: "Who is blind but my servant (hoi pais mou), or deaf like my messenger whom I send? Who is blind like my dedicated one,or blind like the servant of the Lord?" (hoi doulos tou theou). Certainly in the New Testament the use of pais is more commonly the positive understanding, but the possibility of Isaiah as the background of the Philippian hymn need not be

discounted on the basis of the use of doulos. Dodd also notes, "Douleuein is used of the Servant in the LXX of Isa. 53:11."[30]

As to the objection against comparing 'arah to kenoo, a judgment against the "Septuagint usage" has little basis, since kenoo itself appears only twice, both instances in Jeremiah, with the sense of "languish." Its appearance there renders the Hebrew 'amal, or "feverish." The cognate that appears in Isa. 49:4, kenos, appears only here. The only cognate that appears enough times to make any sort of judgment is kenos, usually signifying "empty." This word most commonly renders the Hebrew verb riq, "to empty out" or "pour out." Perhaps the verdict here should be "lack of evidence," but if cognate usage carries any weight at all, it would seem at least not to speak against the sense of kenoo in the Philippian passage. A related consideration is the word used in Isa. 53:12 for "poured out," paredothe, which renders 'arah only here in the Septuagint. By far the most common rendering of paradidomi is for natan, which carries the idea of "giving," "presenting," or "offering." A conjecture may be offered that the Septuagint translators sought to emphasize this aspect of the "pouring out" or to emphasize the idea of the Servant's voluntary act in the matter.

The idea that Paul nowhere refers to Jesus as "servant" is a possibility only if doulos is in the minds of the critics who hold the position. However, Paul does in one place speak of Christ as diakonos, translated as "servant." Also, Paul's reference to Christ "becoming poor" (II Cor. 8:9) is another indication that this concept is not foreign to Paul's thought. Perhaps in the hymn, in order to maintain a strong contrast to show the depth of humility of Christ, doulos served the purpose better. For the same reason, pais may have been rejected because it weakened the contrast.

Martin's comment about the lack of soteriological value is strange, since it runs counter to his earlier comment against relying on the absence of ideas to make determinations.[31] Paul's purpose in exhortation takes precedence over soteriological concerns, so that we need not expect to find them present. The

comment he makes concerning the uncertainty of the object of Christ's obedience tends to overemphasize the presence of direct reference in order to make conclusions. The second half of the hymn begins with "therefore," tying it to the first, and follows with "God also highly exalted him," an indication that the exaltation is tied to the preceding discussion. Since the obedience is part of that discussion, then obedience to God is a simple assumption, and this obedience was "unto death," a path of the Father's will that led to the cross.

The idea that this interpretation puts the cross before the Incarnation need not be understood quite so rigidly. The comparison of ekenosen with 'arah need not indicate that the "self-emptying" was an immediate "emptying unto death"; the passage in Isaiah is a summary statement--"I will allot him a portion with the great. . . because he poured out himself to death." All of the preceding discussion was involved in the Servant's "pouring out." Both describe a process of emptying; the idea of Christ in the Philippian hymn is a furtherance of his humiliation, not just a subsequent action.

Bornkamm makes a good observation of the solidarity with the human condition shown by the act of Christ in the Philippian passage. But does this negate the idea that he is different? After all, who among humankind could be said to exchange the form of God for the form of a servant, or human form? Or who has been exalted to receive the "name above every name," to receive universal homage? The indication seems to be that the difference is still accentuated, probably to show the depth to which Christ chose to go to achieve the solidarity Bornkamm speaks of.

What conclusions may be drawn from the discussion of this passage? The thematic and linguistic parallels are remarkable, probably even more so than with the Second Adam theory. And these similarities are a true parallel, since the segment in Isaiah follows the three-fold pattern found in the hymn of humiliation-obedience-exaltation. Another point may be noted, "The exaltation does not simply follow the humiliation, but is a consequence of or recompense for that humiliation."[32] If

Phil. 2:6-11 is patterned after the Servant Songs, this may be a key point in understanding the problematic interpretation of the exaltation in the hymn as a "reward." Rather than seeing the reward theme as intentional, it may be viewed as simply a part of the original pattern. All in all, the idea that the Philippian hymn may have been influenced by, or patterned after, the Servant Songs of Isaiah, should not be lightly dismissed. The best description of its influence may be "subtly but deeply."[33]

The Heavenly Man Theory

Some brief mention may be made of the theory set forth by Kaesemann concerning a Hellenistic background in the "heavenly redeemer" myth. He bases the origin of the hymn on the myth of the Urmensch-Saviour who descends to come under subjection to the "cosmic powers," then ascends in victory and dominion over these powers.[34] The theory has been rejected by recent scholarly opinion on several grounds.

> Kaesemann's appeal to a pre-Christian Gnostic redeemer myth has been rejected by contemporary NT scholarship. Apart from the question of the legitimacy of appealing to second-century documents in support of a Gnostic background in general, there is considerable doubt as to whether a complete redeemer myth existed in the pre-Christian period. . . Further, reference in Phil. 2:6-11 to a real incarnation (v. 7), to God's sovereign intervention on behalf of the Redeemer (v. 9), and to his investiture with the highest of honours (vv. 9-11) makes the hymn essentially different from the Gnostic myth.[35]

Thus the basic threads of comparison are not strong enough to support this interpretation. The suggestion has also been rejected on the basis of Pauline thought. "St. Paul would strongly deny any suggestion that the primal Adam was a 'heavenly man'. . . and he would equally strongly deny that the pre-existent Son of God was a heavenly man. . . Thus, neither 'the first Adam' nor 'the last Adam' (I Cor. 15:45) fulfils [sic] the role of the Gnostic 'heavenly man'" (emphasis author's).[36]

The suggestion of this myth as a background for the hymn certainly seems to involve a great deal of "reading in" to find

support. Perhaps the best conclusion about the interpretation is that of Cullmann, "All externally introduced parallels. . . are indeed interesting from the standpoint of comparative religion, but exegetically they are nevertheless far-fetched."[37] A far more reliable approach would be to look for the background in Old Testament or early Christian thought.

CHAPTER SIX NOTES

1 Dunn, 115.

2 Harry Johnson, The Humanity of the Saviour, (London: Epworth, 1962), 85.

3 John Harvey, "A New Look at the Christ Hymn in Philippians 2:6-11," Expository Times 76 (July 1965): 338.

4 Ibid.

5 Dunn, 118.

6 Hooker, From Adam to Christ, 96.

7 Dunn, 121.

8 Glasson, 138.

9 See, for example, Dawe, Form of A Servant, 40.

10 O'Brien, 263-64.

11 Feinberg, 29.

12 Wright, Climax of the Covenant, 92.

13 Ibid.

14 Foerster, 474.

15 D. F. Hudson, "A Further Note on Philippians ii:6-11," Expository Times 77 (Oct. 1965): 29.

16 Dunn, 119.

17 Ibid.

18 Furness, "Behind the Philippian Hymn," 181.

19 David M. Stanley, The Apostolic Church in the New Testament, (Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1966), 347-48.

20 A. M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors, (London: SCM, 1961), 43-44.

21 Wright, Climax of the Covenant, 60.

22 O'Brien, 270.

23 Morna D. Hooker, Jesus and the Servant, (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1959), 121.

24 Elias Andrews, The Meaning of Christ for Paul, (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1949), 159.

25 Ralph P. Martin, The New Century Bible Commentary: Philippians, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 98-99.

26 Feinberg, 38.

27 Gunther Bornkamm, Early Christian Experience. (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), 114.

28 Zimmerli and Jeremias, 97.

29 Feinberg, 37.

30 Dodd, 292.

31 Martin, Carmen Christi, 58.

32 Feinberg, 37.

33 H. Wheeler Robinson, 105.

34 Kaesemann, 63.

35 O'Brien, 193-94.

36 Alan Richardson, An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, (New York: Harper & Bros., 1958), 247.

37 Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, trans. Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall, (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1959), 175.

CHAPTER SEVEN

The Meaning of the Phrase "In Christ"

Some Notes on Paul's Use of the Phrase

Very closely related to the framework of ethics which has already been established here is Paul's use of the term "in Christ." Or, more to the point, the question for this passage is whether or not Paul's normal use of the phrase is what is intended here. To be certain, the phrase is extremely common in Paul, appearing over 160 times,[1] and perhaps coined by Paul.[2] John B. Nielson, whose study of the phrase will be examined here, lists a total of 240 times the phrase in all its variations appears, with only 164 of these expressing the phrase, as he terms it, "In its proper sense."[3] He sees the origin of the phrase in Paul's vivid experience on the Damascus road:

> Paul entered into a new experience and relationship with God. And he affirms that it was made possible through and in relation with Christ Jesus. . . . Here, then, is a unique phrase, that is, en Christo, arising, not out of great thinking, but out of a great experience.[4]

Just what did this experience and the resulting phrase mean in the mind of Paul? A simple but true answer to that question is, everything. Paul tells the Philippians, "To me living is Christ, and dying is gain" (Phil. 1:21). Whether in life or in death, Christ was the center of Paul's new life. This new center found its best expression in the phrase "in Christ," a technical formulation that also found expression as "in the Christ," "in whom," "in him," "in Christ Jesus," and "in Jesus Christ."

For Paul, this "new creation" is the impartation of the righteousness of Christ to replace the old life of striving to earn the righteousness of the law. The center of the new person is Christ Himself in the believer. This new union is not immediately produced in all respects, so that there is still the tension between the "already" and the "not yet." Thus, even though Paul was able to write to those he termed as "in Christ," those who had been baptized "into Christ," he still "saw to his

sorrow that many claimed to be in Christ and yet failed to live worthily of the gospel of Christ."[5] Paul saw the need to encourage and exhort those who still did not find the total "new creation" within. These exhortations are always Christ-centered, so that "the indwelling Christ becomes both the restraining and constraining ethical influence in the life of the believer."[6]

However, although Christ-centered, these exhortations still bear the marks of the old way, simply because the Law finds its fullest expression in Christ. The ethical commands in Paul are given in full recognition that Christ is the one who will produce the result called for. Christ is the source of Paul's moral understanding, but the form of his exhortations must still take the form of commands, which will naturally resemble the old way of life under the Law.

> Paul argues that the Law had been unable to do what it promised, i.e., to give men life. . . . but when he comes to spell out what living in Christ means, he tends to do so in terms of ethical commands taken from the Law.[7]

The reality of human freedom simply cannot be dismissed. Paul's common expression of the "new creation" does not preclude further "growth in grace," in which human cooperation of the will is necessary. Bultmann says, "As there are degrees of 'faith'. . . so there are degrees of existence in Christ, such as 'babes in Christ' (I Cor. 3:1), 'approved in Christ' (Rom. 16:10), or 'wise in Christ' (I Cor. 4:10)."[8] Progression from one degree to the next is what Paul encourages in his exhortations, expecting both cooperation with Christ and dependence on Christ. Nielson calls it a "two-directional experience: man in Christ, and Christ in man. Paul is best understood in that term of expression that represents man's experience of God as mutual or common to both. And <u>en Christo</u> best represents this type of experience."[9]

<u>The Position of Kaesemann</u>

Kaesemann rejects the <u>imitatio christi</u> which had been the

standard interpretation of the passage for centuries. Kaesemann follows the thinking of Dibelius' commentary in his interpretation, which rejects the AV rendering of verse five, "Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus." Kaesemann translates "among you" (en hymin) rather than "in you," and en Christo he offers his "technical" use of the phrase, "in the realm of Christ" rather than "in Christ." Thus his basic understanding is that "the Philippians are admonished to conduct themselves toward one another as is fitting within the realm of Christ."[10]

Neither Kaesemann nor Dibelius was first in setting forth this type of interpretation. Kennedy followed the same line, and even he mentioned the work of Deissman before him: "The sense is thoroughly apt. Christians then, as now, were often different in their ordinary dealing and relations from what they were in their strictly life. The two spheres were at times kept distinct."[11] Kennedy, however, does not separate the interpretation from ethics: "Paul is dealing with a question of practical ethics, the marvellous condescension and unselfishness of Christ."[12]

Kaesemann's Position Examined

The separation of the hymn's interpretation from the realm of ethics is a major concern of Kaesemann, for which there may be explanations. Kaesemann prefers to place the hymn within the realm of soteriology: "The objectivity of its language is obviously better suited for the description of a salvation-event than for a parenetic exhortation."[13] Hurtado points to Kaesemann's concerns that the ethical position would

> reduce the work of Christ here to being a representative of a generally valid norm of conduct, an example that lowliness and service will be rewarded. Thereby, the soteriological nature of Christ's work is lost from view, and the Christian message of justification for sinners is changed into mere moral exhortation.[14]

It is interesting to note that those who supported the same sort of interpretation of "in Christ" before Kaesemann were nevertheless supporters of the ethical interpretation also.

A couple of problems are presented by Kaesemann's effort to divorce the hymn from its context. First, he loses the paraenetic context entirely; and secondly, by this separation he seems to overlook the fact that the passage was addressed to those already "within the realm of Christ." He removes the hymn completely from its context, introduces an unlikely hypothesis as to its "original form," and re-inserts the hymn back into its context, then deals with the problems presented to the text by this construction. No distinction seems to be made between justification and sanctification, between the initiation of the Christian life and the continuation of it. For example, Berkouwer says, "Sanctification is not a 'process,' certainly not a moral process, but it is being holy in Christ and having part, through faith, in his righteousness. The imperative in Paul is identical with: Believe!'"[15] The same sort of thinking sees to be present in Kaesemann's thinking--he attempts a dialectic of the positional standing of the believer (or the indicative) with the desired state (or the imperative). But he leans so much more strongly toward the indicative that the imperative, or the progressive aspect, or sanctification, becomes swallowed up in the indicative, the standing, or justification. Since Kaesemann's attempted dialectic lends so much weight toward justification, might not his concerns be misdirected when speaking of those who are already in Christ?

A substantial objection to the position may be offered in consideration of the change in focus that is produced when Kaesemann's understanding of "in Christ" is used. His interpretation points more toward the believer than to Christ, because of the flow of "Have this mind among you, which you also have in Christ Jesus." The most natural following passage would be a further explication of the mind which those addressed are assumed to have, rather than a hymn about the Person or actions of Christ. The traditional interpretation produces a more natural flow of thought, because the hymn easily lends itself as a further elaboration upon the "mind of Christ."

Another concern with Kaesemann's position is its reduction of a full developed theology of human freedom.

> It reduces the significance of human action by envisaging statements about the Christian's being 'in Christ' as purely indicative and not entailing the transformation of human character. Ethics is effectively reduced to acknowledgement of Christ's Lordship; the obedience to that lordly reign, which Kaesemann sees as the human response to the soteriological drama, appears to be an almost disembodied state, and certainly not something recognisable as a human course of action, a virtue, or the disposition of a subject in history. Once again, the subject as agent has all but vanished.[16]

Some further remarks may be addressed here to a few difficult statements made by Kaesemann. He expresses a dissatisfaction with the conclusion of the hymn as it relates to the ethical interpretation: "If the conclusion lacks any paraenetic reference, then the passage as a whole can hardly be interpreted in terms of the theme of the ethical example."[17] A point of disagreement here may be that if, as Kaesemann suggests, the hymn is not Paul's, and if it deals not with Paul's use of it in exhortation, but deals with "eschatology and soteriology"--then Paul's use of it does not have to find paraenetic reference in every single part of the hymn to make the ethical interpretation valid. In fact, there are plenty of reasons to believe Lohmeyer (quoted by Kaesemann) has an arguable point when he speaks of the exaltation verses as "an unwarranted plus."[18]

An interesting comment by Kaesemann is his rejection of the "application of ethical categories to the pre-existent" because "I believe that the underlying phrase does not describe a decision but a disposition."[19] The second part of his statement, at least, should find agreement. Paul certainly pointed to the disposition, not the decision, of Christ, but in calling for ethical response he speaks to those not thus disposed, and is pointing to Christ not as one simple example among many, but as the supreme exemplar of what he encourages from the Philippians. Kaesemann says that "he is. . . archetype, not model."[20] But to those who are to conform to the archetype, the archetype becomes a model.

In his concluding remarks, Kaesemann says, "We have here the witness that the world belongs to the obedient one, and that he

became lord that we might become obedient. However, we do not become obedient through an example, but through the word which witnesses to the fact that we belong to him."[21] Thus he turns the whole idea of being "in Christ" on his concern with the ethical model, the place of "obedience" in the Christian life. Perhaps this explains his aversion to the position, if he feels that the error might be made of assuming salvation by obedience (and since he emphasizes the soteriology of the passage,that may well be his concern). Paul's admonition to "Do nothing from selfish ambition or conceit, but in humility regard others as better than yourselves" (Phil. 2:3) does not belong to soteriology.

Other Considerations

Some further remarks are necessary in relation to the grammar of the phrase and the problems it causes in its wording and context. The largest problem by far is the fact that Paul does often use the phrase in the sense indicated by Kaesemann. Kaesemann's expression of "in the realm of Christ," though, does not seem to reflect Paul's meaning in quite the same sense. It seems to be a more elaborate statement of what Paul probably meant by simply "being a Christian," "being a member of Christ's Church," etc. The most prevalent Pauline usage of the phrase seems to reflect this sense.

A secondary use of the phrase is to indicate agency, such as II Cor. 5:19, "In Christ God was reconciling the world to himself." The sense here is "through Christ," or "by agency of Christ." However, even if used in this sense, an interpretation would still probably read, "Think this way among you, which you also think "through" Christ Jesus," an indirect reflection of the same type of formulation. The idea of agency has no bearing on the question of whether the sense could be rendered as "the mind that was in Christ." The type of wording from Phil. 2:5 to indicate this sense is simply not found. Also, the sense of an attitude or disposition which is "in" Christ is more commonly

rendered by the simple genitive. For example, Rom. 8:35, "Who will separate us from the love of Christ," expresses Christ's "inner" attitude of love for His followers; II Cor. 10:1, "The meekness and gentleness of Christ," indicates the inner dispositions involved.

Another phrase that may be examined is "in you" (en hymin). An analysis of the use of this phrase tends to support the sense given by Kaesemann also ("among you" rather than "in you"). The sense given here, however, is not overwhelming, perhaps a two-to-one ratio of the sense of "among you" as opposed to the internalized "within you." It is interesting to note that one usage which reflects the minority sense of "within you" appears in the context immediately after the hymn, where Paul encourages the Philippians by reminding them that "it is God who is at work in you, enabling you both to will and to work for his good pleasure" (Phil. 2:13). Its appearance here makes it very possible that the repetition is a parallel of the same intended sense in the preceding context, which would be interpreted, "think this way 'in' you."[22]

The reading of the Authorized Version was the source of "contamination" of the thought of verse five, in the thoughts of some critics, Kaesemann included. The AV substitutes phroneistho, a passive rendering, for the indicative phroneite, and thus arrives at a reading of "Let this mind be in you," with the logical conclusion that the following omission of any verb would call for the addition of "which was also in Christ Jesus" for ho kai en Christo Iesou. Lightfoot viewed the substitution of the passive as one of many "alterations to relieve the grammar of the sentence."[23] If so, then this attempted alteration may reflect an early attempt to reconcile this verb with the traditional ethical understanding of the "mind that was in Christ." If this understanding were accepted, then it would be a strong indication that the generally accepted understanding that had been passed down was always that of exhortation to conform to the "mind that was in Christ," no matter what the problems may be in the reading of the text as it has come to us.

But how natural or unnatural is the sense afforded by either method of supplying the missing verb? Technically, the verb supplied for an omission would ordinarily be some form of the copulative "to be," unless the sentence contains a parallel construction in which the verb would be a quite obvious parallel of a former verb.[24] Whether Kaesemann thus viewed this passage as an indication of this type of parallel is unknown, and that it does not reflect this parallel is clear. There are those who feel, contra Kaesemann, that the passage simply reflects the idea of inner attitude. Vincent, for instance, simply says, "Phronein signifies the general mental attitude or disposition," and follows with an interpretation of "'in you,' not 'among you,' which is precluded by the following en Christo Iesou."[25]

A general tendency (which the reader may have already noticed) is to balance the weight of the arguments so that the situation seems to call for an "either-or" decision. Such limitation of possibilities may not be called for. Marshall says, "An ethical interpretation of the hymn in its context in Philippians is not dependent upon any particular translation of verse 5," and he suggests supplying blepete or oidate as the missing link, with the reasoning that the same construction occurs in Phil. 1:30 and 4:9.[26] Another approach is to find some sort of blend between positions, as C. F. D. Moule does: "Adopt towards one another, in your mutual relations, the same attitude that was found in Christ Jesus."[27]

Summary

The most difficult task for this effort is to try to reconcile the interpretation of this phrase with the ethical interpretation. The tendency here is to go along with C. F. D. Moule's interpretation. The first half of his reading of the verse fits well with the context, since Paul has already made the call for unity and looking to the interests of others (vv. 2, 4); the idea of "mutual relations" thus blends well with the thought. Moule's rejection of Kaesemann is based partly on the difficulty that

> Christians could be conceived of. . . as adopting one attitude in their mutual relations with one another, and another attitude as incorporated in Christ. A study of the Epistles suggests, rather, that the two relationships are one and inseparable.[28]

The strongest consideration in supporting Moule in this interpretation is the flow of thought of the surrounding context in the Philippian epistle. Although the grammatical construction does not necessarily support the interpretation, the tradition which has come down to us has affirmed the focus of the passage as the "mind which was in Christ," and the attempts to alleviate the grammatical structure have been aimed toward maintaining this interpretation.

CHAPTER SEVEN NOTES

1 Ceslaus Spicq, "To Live in Christ: Reflections on 'Pauline Morality,'" A Companion to Paul: Readings in Pauline Theology, ed. Michael J. Taylor, (New York: Alba House, 1975), 142.

2 John B. Nielson, In Christ: The Significance of the Phrase "In Christ" in the Writings of St. Paul, (Kansas City: Beacon Hill, 1960), 32. Nielson says, "There are only three instances where the phrase en christo is used outside of Paul."

3 Ibid., 63.

4 Ibid., 29.

5 Enslin, 119.

6 Nielson, 73.

7 Hooker, Preface to Paul, 75.

8 Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. 1, trans. Kendrick Grobel, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), 328.

9 Nielson, 93.

10 Kaesemann, 84.

11 H. A. A. Kennedy, The Expositor's Greek Testament, Vol. 3, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1897), 434.

12 Ibid., 435.

13 Kaesemann, 65.

14 Hurtado, 115.

15 G. C. Berkouwer, Faith and Sanctification, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952), 104.

16 Webster, "Imitation of Christ," 108.

17 Kaesemann, 53.

18 Ibid.

19 Ibid., 64.

20 Ibid., 74.

21 Ibid., 88.

22 A valid objection may be offered that the sense of "in you" is usually reflected by the reflexive heautos (see, e.g., Mt. 3:9, 9:3). However, examples of "in you" rather than "among you" are easily found (see II Cor. 13:3, 5; Col. 1:27).

23 Lightfoot, 109.

24 Joseph Dongell, telephone interview, Asbury Theological Seminary, May 28, 1994.

25 Marvin R. Vincent, "The Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon," The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, 4th ed., Vol. 36, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1950), 57.

26 I. Howard Marshall, "The Christ-Hymn in Philippians 2:5-11," Tyndale Bulletin 19 (1968): 118.

27 C. F. D. Moule, "Further Reflexions," 265.

28 Ibid., 265-66.

CHAPTER EIGHT
The Question of Pre-Existence

Another question that must be addressed is whether the passage speaks of a pre-existent Christ or is intended as a representation of only His earthly life. Because the support or denial of this point has such close relation to the Second Adam theory, discussion in this area may be considered vital to the present effort.

Linguistic Considerations

Since linguistic matters are usually a prime consideration, attention will focus in this area. The first term to be dealt with is the participle hyparchon. The common contention here is that the word denotes an antecedent condition. Vincent concedes as much, but adds, "On the other hand, it sometimes denotes a present as related to future condition."[1] Since the action of the main verb of the sentence is aorist, the former understanding is a safe assumption. The verb is formed from a compound of hypo and archo: hypo in relation to time means "at" or "about"; archo carries the sense of "to begin." Thus the arrival at a conclusion of antecedence is well-based. With only a dozen uses of the term in the Pauline epistles, no clear-cut decision is possible; however, the sense of an antecedent condition is clearly expressed in I Cor. 11:7 and Gal. 2:14. The only further clarification necessary on the point is advised by Lightfoot, "The word denotes 'prior existence,' but not necessarily 'eternal existence.' The latter idea however follows in the present instance from the conception of the divinity of Christ which the context supposes."[2]

Other arguments center around the term morphe. For those who understand hyparchon as an antecedent condition, then morphe naturally rides with the verb. Knox asserts, "Paul undoubtedly affirmed the pre-existence of Christ. . . I take this, rather than something more particular and specific, to be Paul's meaning

when he speaks of Christ as having been 'in the form of God.'"[3] For those holding to a Second Adam interpretation of the passage, morphe takes on a different understanding, as the "image of God" in comparison to the First Adam, thus placing the discussion of these verses during Christ's earthly life. Even so, a supporter of the theory like Dunn still says, "The choice confronting Christ was as archetypal and determinative for mankind as was Adam's; whether the choice was made by the pre-existent Christ or the historical Jesus is immaterial to the Philippian hymn" (emphasis author's).[4] A couple of objections may be voiced to this assertion: (1) if the comparison/contrast with Adam is to be maintained, it must be remembered that Paul says "the second man is from heaven," an indication that pre-existence is not "immaterial"; (2) if the choice was made by a pre-existent Christ, then the choice becomes greater by degree, as the humiliation involves a step further down. Dawe carries the thought a step too far: "He shared in what is characteristic of God. But at the same time he is the preexistent Heavenly Man, the pure image of God who is a God-man already in his preexistence."[5] Logically, this is unacceptable, because if He were already man, the idea of the exchange of the one form for the other would lose its meaning.

Of some interest also is the "mediating" interpretation which allows the passage to include both pre-existence and earthly life. Cave remarks, "St. Paul is here emphasizing that the Incarnation was a voluntary act. Yet the antithesis is probably alien from Paul's thought. He was not concerned to divide Christ's career. For him, the Man who had lived on earth was continuous with the Lord in heaven."[6] Perhaps this sort of thought was behind the earlier remark by Dunn--the location of the choice made was "immaterial" because it reflected the same attitude. Stagg suggests the same sort of thought, "The 'mind' that was Christ's when he became incarnate remained with him all the way to the cross and his exaltation."[7] If this understanding is not unfounded, and the context may indicate so, then H. C. G. Moule is correct in carrying the focus on humility

through verse seven. "It is plainly implied (ver. 7) that His voluntary humiliation included His becoming doulos and taking homoioma anthropon. So the will to humble Himself was antecedent to that condition, and so to Incarnation."[8] Again, we come full circle to face the choice and the attitude behind it, and again we come to see the best representation of the contextual understanding in the idea of pre-existence.

Others support the concept of pre-existence through different routes. Lohmeyer (quoted by Martin) says of "being obedient unto death," "Only a divine being can accept death as obedience; for ordinary men it is a necessity."[9] Another more common way of approaching support of pre-existence is a comparison with II Cor. 8:9--"For you know the generous act of our Lord Jesus Christ, that he became poor, so that by his poverty you might become rich." The natural comparison has been to equate the "becoming poor" with the "self-emptying" of the Philippian hymn. Craddock relates, "Becoming 'poor' does not refer to becoming penniless but rather to the whole event of the incarnation, the eternal under conditions of time, the noncontingent being made subject to all the contingencies of human experiences."[10] Self-emptying with the understanding of pre-existence becomes self-emptying to the fullest.

With previous discussions having already established that humility is the first focus in Paul's thought, the passage understood in that light must be understood from an acceptance of pre-existence. For Paul, the exhortation he encourages involves, as a first consideration, attitude (signified by phroneite). Thus the understanding of verse six must involve the attitude expressed by "did not regard equality with God as something to be exploited." But for Paul also, attitude must eventuate in action, so that the act of humility becomes expressed by "emptied himself, taking the form of a slave" (v. 7). Keeping in mind Paul's focus on attitude/action, the suggested parallel passage (II Cor. 8:9) may take on a new dimension in comparison with the text in Philippians: "For you know the generous act of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he

became poor, so that by his poverty you might become rich." "Generous" indicates the attitude that leads to the act of "becoming poor." Included in this passage, though, is a thought that is merely supposed in the hymn: "for your sakes. . . so that by his poverty you might become rich." Not only does the idea of becoming poor indicate pre-existence (because Christ was never "rich" in His earthly life), but the context of this passage (v. 8) includes a theme that critics find missing from the hymn--"I am testing the genuineness of your love." Thus II Cor. 8:9 not only provides a background for an idea of pre-existence which is in a sense presupposed rather than stated outright in the hymn, it also provides an expression of Christ's love which is never stated explicitly in the hymn.

The implications should be clear: the divine pre-existent Son displayed the attitude of humility and concern for others rather than Himself, showing by the act of "self-emptying" His willingness to identify with humankind, becoming "obedient" to a death He could not otherwise know. To say that we cannot imitate the act is true; but we can understand by His act the attitude of humility that shuns self-seeking. And we understand this in no better way than through the Incarnation. "The great purpose of the entire passage is to represent the Incarnation of the Divine Son as an act of immeasurable condescension."[11]

CHAPTER EIGHT NOTES

1 Vincent, 58.

2 Lightfoot, 110

3 John Knox, The Humanity and Divinity of Christ: A Study of Pattern in Christology, (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1967), 24.

4 Dunn, 120.

5 Dawe, 40.

6 Sydney Cave, The Gospel of St. Paul: A Reinterpretation in the Light of the Religion of His Age and Modern Missionary Experience, (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1928), 77.

7 Stagg, 344.

8 H. C. G. Moule, The Epistle to the Philippians, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981), 37.

9 Ralph P. Martin, The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians: An Introduction and Commentary, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 102.

10 Fred B. Craddock, The Pre-Existence of Christ in the New Testament, (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968), 104.

11 Robert L. Ottley, The Doctrine of the Incarnation, Vol. 1, (London: Roxburghe, 1919), 106.

CHAPTER NINE
Conclusion

The discussion turns now to the difficult task of piecing together the wide range of ideas and tying them to the focus of this study. Ethical considerations must now come to the forefront to determine their place within the discussion of the individual problems covered.

A model of Christian ethics has been proposed, in which Christ is the revelation of the Law, thus replacing the written ethical code as the "pattern" or "model" to look to for moral guidance. Humans as free moral agents must choose (or "respond to") the divine love which finds its best expression in Christ. Thus Christian ethical behavior is a response motivated by love as expressed in Christ's self-giving love.

For Paul, this response finds expression in the place of koinonia, a "participation" and "fellowship" in Christ. Paul distinguishes strongly between Christian obedience and obedience to the Law, yet still expresses himself in terms that resemble ethical commands. He thus distinguishes between indicative and imperative, calling for obedience, but basing it on reliance upon the enablement and empowerment of the dynamic influence of the indwelling Holy Spirit. Attitude for Paul must necessarily eventuate in action, if one is to reveal participation "in Christ." He urges imitatio, usually of himself, but qualified by remarks of his own imitation of Christ. A groundwork may thus be laid for imitation of Christ, better expressed as conformity, through the enabling work of the Holy Spirit, so that Christian ethics, though different in form, still come into play in Pauline thought, particularly in the passage in question.

Concerning the phrase "in Christ," conclusions are difficult to state with any certainty. Evidence may well support Kaesemann's rendering of en Christo Iesou as an indication of the union or participation and sharing of the Philippians with one another as members of the body of Christ. However, en hymin is not clear, particularly when compared with the idea of "God at

work in you" in verse twelve. Also, Silva states, "Those who are united with Christ live as He did (cf. I John 2:6), and so the notion of Jesus as an ethical example is implicit in Phil. 2:5 by the very nature of the subject matter."[1] Thus a separation of the ethical interpretation from Kaesemann's understanding of "in Christ" is not necessary. An expression of the verse then may read, "Think among yourselves as it is necessary to think in view of your corporate union with Christ."[2]

Influences on composition are harder to pinpoint in their direct bearing on ethical considerations. The influence of Second Adam theory in particular is hard to determine because it is so closely tied to interpretations of morphe, harpagmos, and pre-existence. The earlier discussion on pre-existence has provided a strong ground for its validity, particularly Lohmeyer's comment that only someone already divine becomes "obedient" to death. By this understanding, morphe must first be referred to the pre-existent Christ, whether the view of its continuance is accepted or not. The interpretation of harpagmos then becomes tied, by antithesis to the "emptying," to the pre-existent morphe which Christ willingly exchanged for the morphe doulou.

Though the intertwining of morphe and harpagmos with the idea of pre-existence seems to take the passage away from the Second Adam speculation, it need not do so. After all, if pre-existence is seen as a purposeful contrast showing Christ's humility, the contrast to Adam becomes more evident in Adam's self-serving "grasping" (or "snatching"). And if Wright's interpretation of ekenosen as "to make powerless" (i.e., "made Himself powerless") is acceptable, then the antithesis provided by the powerless, obedient servant fits the Adam contrast better, because it strengthens the more natural contrast of obedience/disobedience. The theory that the Adam contrast is present in the passage is difficult to deny entirely. A better suggestion is that though its presence is detectable, it is there in thought only, not necessarily as an intentional written expression.

The presence of the Isaiah Servant Songs in the hymn is more easily seen, because of the strong linguistic and thematic parallels. And while the Second Adam comparison involves mainly contrast, the Isaiah passages may be said to be a true parallel. While Second Adam contrasts may parallel the two thoughts of humility and obedience, the exaltation is not discussed in comparison passages. The Isaiah passages cover the entire range of the hymn by including exaltation along with the ideas of humiliation and obedience.

The reason for the suggestion of including the exaltation and comparing with Isaiah rather than Second Adam becomes clear in the discussion on authorship. Not only do linguistic similarities between text and context hint a Pauline authorship, these similarities are seen as far after the hymn as the end of chapter three. Extending the focus of the paraenetic context to include the exaltation and its meaning for the believer at the end of chapter three, a stronger case may be made for the Suffering Servant background which also carries the thematic focus through to exaltation. The idea would then be that the author relied on the Isaiah Suffering Servant as the background for composition (probably the Hebrew) and had at the same time a contrast with Adam in the back of his mind as he wrote.

Carrying these suggestions through and extending the exhortation beyond its "normal" bounds, a paraphrase might read something like this:

"Let this same attitude of humility that I have just described to you be your own attitude in your relations with one another. After all, Jesus exhibited just such an attitude: He existed in the same form as God, being apprehended as God (by heavenly beings, who are capable of perception of his heavenly form of existence), and having the same advantages and rights, yet He chose to lay aside this form and these rights by revealing Himself in actual human existence; not only that, He chose the lowly condition of a slave, humbling Himself even further by choosing a path of obedience totally contrary to His positional rights, being obedient to His Father in all things, even to the

extent that He chose death on a cross in accordance with the Father's wishes. On this account, God exalted Him to the highest position, and gave Him the name which is deserving of rank and dignity far above any other name, so that at this name of Jesus, every knee should bow, of all things above, below, and in the earth, and that every tongue might confess with thanksgiving that Jesus Christ is Lord of all things, to the glory of God the Father.

Keep this attitude by obeying me, especially now that I am absent, by thoroughly working out every aspect of your salvation, remembering that it is God who works in you through His Holy Spirit, giving the enablement and motivation necessary to will and work for His desires. Keep this attitude in mind by refraining from arguing and complaining, so that you will shine like stars in the world, in spite of the crooked environment in which you live.

Join together in imitating me, and also those who already live according to the example we have set. Remember that we are citizens of the heavenly realm, and that we expect the return of Jesus Christ the Savior. Just as He was humiliated and subsequently exalted to heavenly glory, so also He will transform our humiliated bodies to conform to His, by the same power with which He subjects all things to himself" (Phil. 2:5-15, 3:17, 20-21).

CHAPTER NINE NOTES

1 Silva, 110.

2 Ibid., 107.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andrews, Elias. The Meaning of Christ for Paul. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1949.

Baillie, D. M. God Was in Christ: An Essay on Incarnation and Atonement. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948.

Bakken, Norman K. "The New Humanity: Christ and the Modern Age." Interpretation 22, No. 1 (Jan. 1968): 71-82.

Barrett, C. K. From First Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962.

Beardslee, William A. Human Achievement and Divine Vocation in the Message of Paul. Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1961.

Beare, F. W. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.

Beet, Joseph Agar. "Thought it not Robbery to be Equal with God." Expositor 5, 3rd ser., (1887): 115-25.

Behm, J. "Harpazo, Harpagmos." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Ed. Gerhard Kittel. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.

Berkouwer, G. C. Faith and Sanctification. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952.

Bornkamm, Gunther. Early Christian Experience. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Bruce, A. B. The Humiliation of Christ. In its Physical, Ethical, and Official Aspects. Cincinnati: Jennings & Graham, 1895.

Bruce, F. F. "St. Paul in Macedonia. The Philippian Correspondence." John Rylands University Library 63, No. 2 (Spring 1981): 260-84.

Bultmann, Rudolf. Theology of the New Testament. Vol. 1. Trans. Kendrick Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.

Caird, G. B. The Apostolic Age. London: Gerald Duckworth, 1955.

Cave, Sydney. The Gospel of St. Paul: A Reinterpretation in the Light of the Religion of His Age and Modern Missionary Experience. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1928.

Cerfaux, L. Christ in the Theology of Saint Paul. Trans.

Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker. New York: Herder & Herder, 1959.

Chrysostom, John. "Works." A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Ed. Philip Schaff. Vol. 13. New York: Christian Literature Co., 1889.

Clarke, W. K. Lowther. New Testament Problems: Essays-Reviews-Interpretations. New York: MacMillan, 1929.

Craddock, Fred B. The Pre-existence of Christ in the New Testament. Nashville: Abingdon, 1968.

Cullmann, Oscar. The Christology of the New Testament. Trans. Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1959.

Davies, W. D. "Ethics in the New Testament." The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Nashville: Abingdon, 1990.

_____. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology. London: SPCK, 1948.

Dawe, Donald G. "A Fresh Look at the Kenotic Christologies." Scottish Journal of Theology 15, No. 4 (Dec. 1962): 337-49.

_____. The Form of a Servant: A Historical Analysis of the Kenotic Motif. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.

Dewar, Lindsay. An Outline of New Testament Ethics. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1949.

Dodd, C. H. Review of Theologisches Woerterbuch sum Neuen Testament, by Gerhard Kittel. Journal of Theological Studies 39 (Jan. 1938): 286-93.

Dunn, James D. G. Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980.

Enslin, Morton Scott. The Ethics of Paul. New York: Abingdon, 1957.

Fairweather, Eugene R. "The 'Kenotic' Christology." In A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians. F. W. Beare. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.

Feinberg, Paul D. "The Kenosis and Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Analysis of Phil. 2:6-11." Trinity Journal 1, n.s. 1 (Spring 1980): 21-46.

Foerster, Werner. "Morphe." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Ed. Gerhard Kittel. Trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Vol. 4. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.

Furness, J. M. "Behind the Philippian Hymn." Expository Times 79, No. 6 (Mar. 1968): 178-82.

_____. "The Authorship of Philippians ii. 6-11." Expository Times 70, No. 8 (May 1959): 240-43.

Furnish, Victor Paul. Theology and Ethics in Paul. Nashville: Abingdon, 1968.

Gifford, E. H. "The Incarnation: A Study of Philippians II. 5-11." Expositor, 5th ser., 4 (1896): 161-77, 241-63.

Glasson, T. Francis. "Two Notes on the Philippians Hymn (II. 6-11)." New Testament Studies 21, No. 1 (Oct. 1974): 133-39.

Greenlee, J. Harold. An Exegetical Summary of Philippians. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1992.

Gustafson, James F. Christ and the Moral Life. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Harvey, John. "A New Look at the Christ Hymn in Philippians 2:6-11." Expository Times 76, No. 10 (July 1965): 337-39.

Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath. A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987.

Hawkins, Robert Martyr. The Recovery of the Historical Paul. Nashville: Vanderbilt UP, 1943.

Hawthorne, Gerald F. "Introduction to Philippians." Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 43. Eds. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker. Waco: Word, 1983.

Hendriksen, William. New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1962.

Holladay, William L. A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993.

Hooker, Morna D. A Preface to Paul. New York: Oxford UP, 1980.

_____. From Adam to Christ: Essays on Paul. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.

_____. "Interchange in Christ." Journal of Theological Studies 22, n.s. 2 (Oct. 1971): 349-61.

_____. Jesus and the Servant. London: Cambridge UP, 1959.

Hoover, Roy W. "The Harpagmos Enigma: A Philological Solution." Harvard Theological Review 64 (1971): 95-119.

Hudson, D. F. "A Further Note on Philippians ii: 6-11." Expository Times 77, No. 1 (Oct. 1965): 29.

Hunter, A. M. Paul and His Predecessors. London: SCM, 1961.

Hurtado, L. W. "Jesus as Lordly Example in Philippians 2:5-11." From Jesus to Paul: Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare. Eds. Peter Richardson and John C. Hurd. Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 1984.

Hurst, L. D. "Re-Enter the Pre-Existent Christ in Philippians 2.5-11?" New Testament Studies 32 (1986): 449-57.

Johnson, Harry. The Humanity of the Saviour. London: Epworth, 1962.

Kaesemann, Ernst. God and Christ: Existence and Province. Vol. 5 of Journal for Theology and the Church. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Keck, Leander E. "Justification of the Ungodly and Ethics." Rechtfertigung. Festschrift fur Ernst Kaesemann. Eds. Johannes Friedrich, Wolfgang Pohlmann, and Peter Stuhlmacher. Tuebingen: I. C. B. Mohr, 1976.

Kennedy, H. A. A. The Expositor's Greek Testament. Ed. W. Robertson Nicoll. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1897.

Knox, John. The Humanity and Divinity of Christ: A Study of Pattern in Christology. London: Cambridge UP, 1967.

Lightfoot, J. B. Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1953.

Lindars, Barnabas. "Imitation of God and Imitation of Christ." Theology 76, No. 638 (Aug. 1973): 394-402.

MacGregor, G. H. C. "Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought." New Testament Studies 1, No. 1 (Sep. 1954): 17-28.

MacQuarrie, John. "The Pre-existence of Jesus Christ." Expository Times 77, No. 7 (Apr. 1966): 199-202.

Marshall, I. Howard. "Incarnational Christology in the New

Testament." Christ the Lord: Studies in Christology Presented to Donald Guthrie. Ed. Harold H. Rowdon. Leicester, Eng.: Inter-Varsity, 1982.

_____."The Christ-Hymn in Philippians 2:5-11." Tyndale Bulletin 19 (1968): 104-27.

Martin, Ralph P. Carmen Christi: Phil. ii.5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1967.

_____. "Morphe in Philippians ii. 6." Expository Times 70, No. 6 (Mar. 1959): 183-84.

_____. The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians: An Introduction and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.

_____. The New Century Bible Commentary: Philippians. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

Maston, T. B. Biblical Ethics: A Guide to The Ethical Message of the Scriptures from Genesis Through Revelation. Macon, Ga.: Mercer UP, 1991.

McClain, Alva J. "The Doctrine of the Kenosis in Philippians 2:5-8." Biblical Review 13, No. 4 (Oct. 1928): 507-27.

Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians, and to Philemon. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1885.

Moiser, Jeremy. "Dogmatic Thoughts on Imitation of Christ." Scottish Journal of Theology 30 (1977): 201-13.

Moule, C. F. D. Essays in New Testament Interpretation. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982.

_____. "Further Reflexions on Philippians 2:5-11." Apostolic History and the Godpel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce on His 60th Birthday. Eds. W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970.

_____. "The Manhood of Jesus in the New Testament," Christ, Faith, and History: Cambridge Studies in Christology. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1972.

Moule, H. C. G. The Epistle to the Philippians. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981.

Moulton, W. F., and A. S. Geden. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1978.

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "Christological Anthropology in Phil., II, 6-11." Revue Biblique 83, No. 1 (Jan. 1976): 25-50.

Nielson, John B. In Christ: The Significance of the Phrase "In Christ" in the Writings of St. Paul. Kansas City: Beacon Hill, 1960.

O'Brien, Peter T. The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text. In New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

Ottley, Robert L. The Doctrine of the Incarnation. Vol. 1. London: Methuen, 1896.

Panikulam, George. Koinonia in the New Testament: A Dynamic Expression of Christian Life. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979.

Plummer, Alfred. A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. London: Roxburghe, 1919.

Porter, Frank Chamberlain. The Mind of Christ in Paul: Light from Paul on Present Problems of Christian Thinking. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930.

Richardson, Alan. An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958.

Robbins, Charles J. "Rhetorical Structure of Philippians 2:6-11." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 42, No. 1 (Jan. 1980): 73-82.

Robinson, H. Wheeler. The Cross in the Old Testament. 2nd ed. London: SCM, 1956.

Robinson, John A. T. The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology. London: SCM, 1963

_____. The Human Face of God. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1973.

Sanders, J. A. "Dissenting Deities and Philippians 2.1-11." Journal of Biblical Literature 88 (Sep. 1969): 279-90.

Sanders, Jack T. The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Religious Background. London: Cambridge UP, 1971.

Scroggs, Robin. The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966.

Silva, Moises. Philippians. In The Wycliffe Exegetical Commentary. Chicago: Moody, 1988.

Smyth, Newman. Christian Ethics. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.

Spicq, Ceslaus. "To Live in Christ: Reflections on "Pauline Morality.'" A Companion to Paul: Readings in Pauline Theology. Ed. Michael J. Taylor. New York: Alba House, 1975.

Spohn, William C. What are They Saying About Scripture and Ethics? New York: Paulist, 1984.

Stagg, Frank. "The Mind in Christ Jesus." Review and Expositor 77, No. 3 (Summer 1980): 337-47.

Stanley, David M. The Apostolic church in the New Testament. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1966.

_____. "The Theme of the Servant of Yahweh in Primitive Christian Soteriology, and its Transposition by St. Paul." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 16, No. 4 (Oct. 1954): 385-425.

Stauffer, Ethelbert. New Testament Theology. Trans. John Marsh. London: SCM, 1955.

Strimple, Robert B. "Philippians 2:5-11 in Recent Studies: Some Exegetical Conclusions." Westminster Theological Journal 41, No. 2 (Spring 1979): 247-68.

Talbert, Charles H. "The Problem of Pre-Existence in Philippians 2.6-11." Journal of Biblical Literature 86 (June 1967): 141-53.

The Analytical Greek Lexicon. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1884.

Thomas, Thomas A. "The Kenosis Question." Evangelical Quarterly 42, No. 3 (Jul.-Sep. 1970): 142-51.

Tinsley, E. J. "Some Principles for Reconstructing a Doctrine of the Imitation of Christ." Scottish Journal of Theology 25, No. 1 (Feb. 1972): 45-57.

_____. The Imitation of God in Paul: An Essay on the Biblical Basis of Christian Spirituality. London: SCM, 1960.

Trench, Richard Chenevix. Synonyms of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969.

Vincent, Marvin R. The Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon. Vol. 36 of The International Critical Commentary

on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. 4th ed. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1950.

Wanamaker, C. A. "Philippians 2.6-11: Son of God or Adamic Christology? New Testament Studies 33, No. 2 (Apr. 1987): 179-93.

Warfield, Benjamin Breckinridge. The Person and Work of Christ. Ed. Samuel G. Craig. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1950.

Webster, John B. "Christology, Imitability, and Ethics." Scottish Journal of Theology 39, No. 3, (1986): 309-26.

_____. "The Imitation of Christ." Tyndale Bulletin 37 (1986): 95-120.

Wigram, George V. The New Englishman's Hebrew Concordance. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1984.

Wiley, H. Orton. Introduction to Christian Theology. Vol. 1. Kansas City: Beacon Hill, 1946.

Wright, N. T. "Harpagmos and the Meaning of Philippians 2: 5-11." Journal of Theological Studies 37, No. 2 (Oct. 1986): 321-52.

_____. The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

Zimmerli, Walther and J. Jeremias. The Servant of God. Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1957.